

On well-posedness for the Benjamin-Ono equation

Nicolas Burq ^{*} and Fabrice Planchon [†]

Abstract

We prove existence of solutions for the Benjamin-Ono equation with data in $H^s(\mathbb{R})$, $s > 0$. Thanks to conservation laws, this yields global solutions for $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R})$ data, which is the natural “finite energy” class. Moreover, unconditional uniqueness is obtained in $L_t^\infty(H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{R}))$, which includes weak solutions, while for $s > \frac{3}{20}$, uniqueness holds in a natural space which includes the obtained solutions.

1 Introduction

Let us consider

$$(1.1) \quad \partial_t u + H\partial_x^2 u + u\partial_x u = 0, \quad u(x, t = 0) = u_0(x), \quad (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Here and hereafter, H is the Hilbert transform, defined by

$$(1.2) \quad Hf(x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int \frac{f(y)}{x - y} dy = \frac{1}{\pi} \text{vp} \frac{1}{x} \star u = \mathcal{F}^{-1}(-i \text{sgn}(\xi) \hat{f}(\xi)).$$

We will restrict ourselves to real-valued u_0 .

REMARK 1.1 *One could deal with complex-valued u_0 at the expense of an additional condition: $u_0 \in \dot{B}_2^{-\frac{1}{2}, 1}$ would probably be sufficient in our setting, and this somehow encodes that u_0 has zero mean, “taming” the behavior of low frequencies.*

Equation (1.1) deals with wave propagation at the interface of layers of fluids with different densities (see Benjamin [1] and Ono [15]), and it belongs to a larger class of equation modeling this type of phenomena, some of which are certainly more physically relevant. Mathematically, however, (1.1) presents several interesting and challenging properties; the exact balance between the degree of the nonlinearity and the smoothing properties of the linear part preclude any hope to achieve results through a direct fixed point procedure, be it in Kato smoothing type of spaces or more elaborate conormal (“Bourgain”) spaces. In fact, the flow associated to (1.1) fails to be C^∞ (Molinet-Saut-Tzvetkov [14], and even uniformly continuous (Koch-Tzvetkov [12]). By standard energy methods (ignoring therefore the dispersive part), one may obtain local in time solutions for smooth data, e.g. $u_0 \in H^s$ with $s > \frac{3}{2}$ and reach $s = \frac{3}{2}$ by taking in account some form of dispersion (Ponce [16] and references therein). On the other hand, (1.1) has global weak L^2 and $H^{\frac{1}{2}}$ solutions (Ginibre-Velo[6]) and this result relies heavily on dispersive estimates for the nonlinear equation as well as

^{*}Département de mathématiques, UMR 8628 du CNRS, Bât 425 Université Paris-Sud, F-91405 Orsay et Institut universitaire de France

[†]Laboratoire Analyse, Géométrie & Applications, UMR 7539 du CNRS, Institut Galilée, Université Paris 13, 99 avenue J.B. Clément, F-93430 Villetaneuse

the following two conservation laws:

$$(1.3) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2(x, t) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_0^2(x) dx,$$

$$(1.4) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\sqrt{-\Delta}^{\frac{1}{2}} u(x, t)|^2 dx + \frac{1}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}} u^3(x, t) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\sqrt{-\Delta}^{\frac{1}{2}} u_0(x)|^2 dx + \frac{1}{3} \int_{\mathbb{R}} u_0^3(x) dx.$$

Recently, progress has been achieved on the Cauchy problem for data in Sobolev spaces, by using more sophisticated methods: Koch and Tzvetkov [11] obtained $s > \frac{5}{4}$, and subsequently Kenig and Koenig [9] improved this result to $s > \frac{9}{8}$ (both use Strichartz estimates which are tailored to the frequency, a procedure directly inspired by work on quasilinear wave equations); Tao [18] obtained H^1 solutions, using a (complex) variant of the Hopf-Cole transform (which linearizes Burgers equation). These solutions can be immediately extended to global ones thanks to another conservation law controlling the $\dot{H}^1$ norm (equation (1.1), being completely integrable, has an infinite hierarchy of conservation laws, a fact which at the moment cannot be connected with the Cauchy problem at low regularity). After completion of the present work (which originally obtained $s > \frac{1}{4}$), we learned that Ionescu and Koenig [8] improved existence all the way down to $s = 0$, which yields global L^2 solutions. While this obviously supersedes our result, uniqueness is meant in the class of limits of smooth solutions; we obtain uniqueness in a natural space (which includes the linear flow) provided $s > \frac{3}{20}$. Moreover, one can then deduce an unconditional well-posedness result for $L^\infty(H^{\frac{1}{2}})$ solutions: this is the natural energy class and it contains the aforementioned weak solutions. Our main result reads as follows:

THEOREM 1 *For any $s > \frac{3}{20}$, there exists a unique strong solution of the Benjamin-Ono equation (1.1), which is $C_{loc}^0(\mathbb{R}_t; H^s(\mathbb{R}_x))$. Furthermore, if $s \geq 1/2$, this solution is global and unique in $L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t; H^s(\mathbb{R}_x))$, while for $\frac{3}{20} < s < 1/2$, uniqueness holds in suitable spaces (see Theorem 3). As a consequence, in the energy space, $H^{1/2}$, weak solutions are strong.*

In fact, in this paper we construct solutions for $s > 0$ and prove along the way that they enjoy better estimates than the mere $L_t^\infty(H^s)$ bound mentioned above. Then using this knowledge, we are able to either prove unconditional uniqueness if $s \geq \frac{1}{2}$, or uniqueness in the construction class if $\frac{1}{8} < s < \frac{1}{2}$. Let us outline briefly the procedure, when $s > \frac{1}{4}$.

- We work with smooth solutions, and obtain a priori estimates in various spaces with low regularity. Classical procedures allow to pass to the limit later on, yielding solutions for low regularity data.
- We perform a renormalization in the spirit of Tao [18]. As far as we know, this trick goes back to Hayashi-Ozawa [7] when dealing with nonlinear Schrödinger equations with derivatives: facing an operator $(\partial_x^2 + a(x)\partial_x)\phi$, one may reduce it to $(\partial_x^2 + (-\partial_x a(x)/2 + a^2(x)/4))\psi$ through conjugation: $\psi = \exp(-\int^x a(y) dy/2)\phi$. As observed in [18], the Hilbert transform is nothing but multiplication by $-i$ on positive frequency; and we may reduce ourselves to positive frequency because the solution is real-valued. As such, the exponential factor will be purely imaginary (otherwise, one needs some form of decay at infinity to make it bounded after space integration) and is therefore irrelevant when dealing with Lebesgue norms.
- Rather than performing the above conjugation globally, we first parilinearize the equation and gauge away only the worst term, which is when a low-high frequencies interaction takes place with the derivative falling on the high frequencies. In effect, we are replacing the exponentiation procedure by a paraproduct with the exponential factor. While this creates a lot of error terms, it highlights clearly which are the terms one should focus on.

- We use (a variant of) conormal spaces $X^{s,b}$; in fact, as remarked by Tao [18], should one silently drop the low-high interaction in the original equation mentioned above, the resulting equation can be proved to be well-posed in $X^{0^+, \frac{1}{2}^+}$. However, we need to deal with the exponential factor coming from the gauge transformation, and this is where an $\frac{1}{4}$ loss occurs in a natural way.
- Inverting the gauge in conormal spaces will lose a $\frac{1}{4}$ factor in spatial regularity (as an interpolation between two “crude” estimates, an $X^{s,0}$ one which does not lose anything and an $X^{s,1}$ which loses only $\frac{1}{2}$ thanks to a smoothing effect). Meanwhile, the gauge action only requires the exponential factor to be roughly in $X^{1, \frac{1}{2}}$ which matches exactly. On the other hand we may still invert the gauge without loss in any Lebesgue-like space-time or time-space norm, which allows to retain our solution at H^s level.
- Obtaining an a priori estimate does not provide uniqueness, and one has to perform a separate argument. This requires taking differences of two solutions, and performing another gauge transform. Dissymmetry leads to worst terms than before, but by using all the a priori knowledge one has on both solutions (and especially one being the limit of smooth solutions constructed before), we are able to close an a priori estimate in (a suitable version of) $X^{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}}$.
- The unconditional uniqueness result in $H^s, s \geq 1/2$ is obtained by adapting slightly the uniqueness result for $s_{\frac{1}{4}^+}$. The main step is to obtain an $L_t^4(L_x^\infty)$ a priori bound on the solution which is then bootstrapped to get a bound in $X^{0, \frac{1}{2}}$; this turns out to be enough to handle the previous uniqueness argument (using that we have $\frac{1}{4}$ — derivatives of scope).

In order to go further down, $s < \frac{1}{4}$, one has to split w in different parts and perform an iteration on the nonlinear quadratic terms using this decomposition, which allows to recover the seemingly hopeless $1/4$ loss from the gauge. We only sketch the proof of the following result.

THEOREM 2 *For any $s > 0$, there exists a strong solution of the Benjamin-Ono equation (1.1), which is $C_{loc}^0(\mathbb{R}_t; H^s(\mathbb{R}_x))$, and unique as a limit of smooth solutions.*

Uniqueness for $0 < s < \frac{1}{4}$ turns out to be much harder than for $s > \frac{1}{4}$ and we only provide an outline of the proof in the case $s > 3/20$; while obtaining existence for $s > \frac{1}{8}$ is a relatively straightforward modification of our main argument for $s > \frac{1}{4}$, the uniqueness part is quite involved and most likely not optimal; there remains a gap in the $0 \leq s \leq \frac{3}{20}$ range.

Finally, we note that L. Molinet has ([13]) obtained (global) well-posedness for the Benjamin-Ono equation on the torus, for $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T})$ data.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Jean-Marc Delort and Nikolay Tzvetkov for numerous helpful and enlightening discussions.

2 Statement of results

Before stating any results, we need to define several functional spaces which will be of help. We start with (inhomogeneous) Besov spaces ([2] for details). Let us recall that a Littlewood-Paley decomposition is a collection of operator $(\Delta_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ defined as follows: let $\phi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\widehat{\phi} = 1$ for $|\xi| \leq 1$ and $\widehat{\phi} = 0$ for $|\xi| > 2$, $\phi_j(x) = 2^{nj} \phi(2^j x)$, $S_j = \phi_j * \cdot$, $\psi_j(x) = (\phi_{j+1} - \phi_j)(x)$,

$\Delta_j = S_{j+1} - S_j = \psi_j * \cdot$. For notational convenience, we may sometimes refer to S_0 as Δ_{-1} . We shall denote by $u_j = \Delta_j u$ and $u_{\prec j} = S_{j-1}u$. Finally, we define the paraproduct between two functions f, g as

$$(2.1) \quad T_g f = \sum_j S_{j-1}(g) \Delta_j(f),$$

which captures the low frequencies (of g) vs high frequencies (of f) interaction in the product gf .

DEFINITION 2.1 *Let f be in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $1 \leq p, q \leq +\infty$. We say f belongs to $B_p^{s,q}$ if and only if*

- $S_0 f \in L^p$.
- The sequence $(\varepsilon_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\varepsilon_j = 2^{js} \|\Delta_j(f)\|_{L^p}$ belongs to l^q .

Two modifications will be of interest, to handle the additional time variable.

DEFINITION 2.2 *Let $u(x, t) \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$. We say that $u \in \mathcal{L}_t^\rho(B_p^{s,q})$ if and only if, for all $j \geq -1$,*

$$(2.2) \quad 2^{js} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L_t^\rho(L_x^p)} = \varepsilon_j \in l^q.$$

DEFINITION 2.3 *Let $u(x, t) \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$. We say that $u \in B_p^{s,q}(\mathcal{L}_t^\rho)$ if and only if, for all $j \geq -1$,*

$$(2.3) \quad 2^{js} \|\Delta_j u\|_{L_x^p(L_t^\rho)} = \varepsilon_j \in l^q.$$

Finally, we define conormal spaces: set

$$(2.4) \quad \Delta_{jk}^\pm v(x, t) = \mathcal{F}_{\tau, \xi}^{-1}(\chi_{\pm \xi \geq 0} \psi_{jk}^\pm(\tau, \xi) \mathcal{F}_{t, x}(v)), \quad \Delta_{jk} v(x, t) = \Delta_{jk}^+ v(x, t) + \Delta_{jk}^- v(x, t)$$

with

$$\psi_{jk}^\pm(\tau, \xi) = \psi_j(\xi) \psi_k(\tau \mp \xi^2),$$

which (dyadically) localizes $|\xi|$ at 2^j and $|\tau \mp \xi^2|$ at 2^k .

DEFINITION 2.4 *Let $u(x, t) \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$, $s, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $1 \leq q \leq +\infty$. We say that $u \in X^{s,b,q}$ if and only if, for all $j \geq -1$,*

$$(2.5) \quad \|\Delta_{jk} u\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \lesssim 2^{-js-kb} \varepsilon_{jk}, \quad (\varepsilon_{jk})_{jk} \in l^q.$$

$X^{s,b,q}$ is endowed with its natural norm. An alternative definition is as follows:

$$(2.6) \quad u \in X^{s,b,q} \Leftrightarrow S_0(-t)u(t, \cdot) \in B_{2,t}^{b,q}; B_{2,x}^{s,q}$$

where $S_0(t) = e^{-tH\partial_x^2}$ is the free evolution group.

DEFINITION 2.5 *For $T > 0$, we say that $u \in X_T^{s,b,q}$ if $u \in X_{loc(t)}^{s,b,q}$ and*

$$(2.7) \quad \|u\|_{X_T^{s,b,q}} = \inf\{\|v\|_{X^{s,b,q}} \text{ with } v \in X^{s,b,q}, (v - u)|_{t \in (-T, T)} = 0, v|_{t \notin [-2T, 2T]} = 0\}$$

We shall use the following result to estimate norms in $X_T^{s,b,q}$

LEMMA 2.6 Consider u the solution of

$$(\partial_t + H\partial_x^2)u = f, \quad u|_{t=0} = u_0.$$

Then for any s and $0 < b < 1$

$$\|u\|_{X_T^{s,b,q}} \leq C_T(\|u_0\|_{B_2^{s,q}} + \|f\|_{X_T^{s,b-1,q}}).$$

Proof: Take a sequence f_n realizing the inf in (2.7) and u_n solution of

$$(\partial_t + H\partial_x^2)u_n = f_n, \quad u|_{t=0} = u_0.$$

Clearly $(u_n - u)|_{|t| \leq T} = 0$. Let us study first the contribution to u_n of the low conormal frequencies ($k = 0$), i.e. let u_n^0 be the solution of

$$(\partial_t + H\partial_x^2)u_n^0 = \sum_j \Delta_{0,j}f_n = f_n^0, \quad u|_{t=0} = u_0.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} (2.8) \quad \|\Delta_j u_n^1\|_{X_T^{s,0,2}} &\leq C\|\Delta_j u_n\|_{L^2(-2T,2T);H^s} \leq C(\|\Delta_j u_0\|_{H^s} + \|\Delta_j f_n^0\|_{L^1(-2T,2T);H^s}) \\ &\leq C(\|\Delta_j u_0\|_{H^s} + \|\Delta_j f_n^0\|_{L^2(-2T,2T);H^s}) \leq C(\|\Delta_j u_0\|_{H^s} + \|\Delta_j f_n^0\|_{X^{s,-1,2}}) \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence

$$\|u_n^1\|_{X^{s,b,q}} \leq C(\|u_0\|_{B^{s,q_2}} + \|f_n^0\|_{X^{s,b-1,q}}).$$

Let us now study the contributions of the high conormal frequencies. Let $u_n^1 = T f_n^1$ be the solution of

$$(\partial_t + H\partial_x^2)u_n^1 = \sum_{k \neq 0, j} \Delta_{k,j}f_n = f_n^0, \quad u|_{t=0} = 0.$$

Then the same argument as above shows that if $g \in X^{s,0,2}$, $v = Tg$ is bounded in $X^{s,0,2}$ and as a consequence, for $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ equal to 1 on $[-T, 2T]$, $w = \phi(t)v$ being a solution of

$$(\partial_t + H\partial_x^2)w = g + \phi'(t)v$$

satisfies

$$i(\tau - |\xi|\xi)\widehat{w}(\tau, \xi) = g + \widehat{\phi'(t)v}(\tau, \xi)$$

and

$$\|w\|_{X^{s,1,2}} \leq C(\|g\|_{X^{s,0,2}} + \|\phi'(t)v\|_{X^{s,0,2}}) \leq C(\|g\|_{X^{s,0,2}})$$

This shows that T is continuous from $X^{s,0,2}$ to $X^{s,1,2}$. By duality (since T^* has essentially the same form as T) it is also continuous from $X^{s,-1,2}$ to $X^{s,0,2}$ and by (real) interpolation in k at fixed j and l^q -summing the j , from $X^{s,b-1,q}$ to $X^{s,b,q}$ (for $0 < b < 1$). Finally we obtained

$$\|u\|_{X_T^{s,b,q}} \leq \|u_n\|_{X^{s,b,q}} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{B^{s,q_2}} + \|f_n\|_{X^{s,b-1,q}} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} \|u_0\|_{B^{s,q_2}} + \|f\|_{X^{s,b-1,q}}.$$

□

Using (2.6) and writing

$$u(t) = S_0(t) \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\tau} e^{it\tau} \mathcal{F}_{t \rightarrow \tau}(S_0(-t)u(t, \cdot)) d\tau.$$

we see easily that $X^{s,\frac{1}{2},1}$ inherits the properties of the solutions of the linear equation $S_0(t)u_0$. We now recall several of them which will be of interest.

PROPOSITION 2.7 *The following properties hold true:*

- *Strichartz*

$$(2.9) \quad \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_t^4(B_\infty^{s,1})} \lesssim \|u\|_{X^{s,\frac{1}{2},1}}.$$

- *Maximal function*

$$(2.10) \quad \|u\|_{B_4^{0,1}(\mathcal{L}_t^\infty)} \lesssim \|u\|_{X^{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{2},1}}.$$

- *Bilinear smoothing*

$$(2.11) \quad \|S_{j-1}u\Delta_j v\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \lesssim 2^{-\frac{j}{2}} \|u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}} \|v\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}}.$$

- *Smoothing*

$$(2.12) \quad \|u\|_{B_\infty^{s+\frac{1}{2},1}(\mathcal{L}_t^2)} \lesssim \|u\|_{X^{s,\frac{1}{2},1}}.$$

Proof: Strichartz, smoothing and maximal function estimates are all classical in the Schrödinger context and extend routinely to the Benjamin-Ono situation. The bilinear estimate is the 1D case of a generic $L_{t,x}^2$ bilinear estimate, namely $\|\Delta_k e^{it\Delta} u_0 \Delta_j e^{\pm it\Delta} v_0\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \lesssim 2^{\frac{n-1}{2}k-\frac{j}{2}} \|\Delta_k u_0\|_2 \|\Delta_j v_0\|_2$, where n is the space dimension. However one can provide a very simple proof of the 1D case through the following identity (which works equally well without a complex conjugation on one factor):

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int e^{-it|\xi-\eta|^2} \bar{g}(\eta-\xi) e^{it|\eta|^2} f(\eta) d\eta \right|^2 &= \int e^{2it\xi(\eta-\lambda)} f(\eta) \bar{f}(\lambda) \bar{g}(\eta-\xi) g(\lambda-\xi) d\eta d\lambda \\ \int \left| \int e^{-it|\xi-\eta|^2} \bar{g}(\eta-\xi) e^{it|\eta|^2} f(\eta) d\eta \right|^2 dt &= \int \delta(2\xi(\eta-\lambda)) f(\eta) \bar{f}(\lambda) \bar{g}(\eta-\xi) g(\lambda-\xi) d\eta d\lambda \\ \int \left| (e^{-it|\cdot|^2} \bar{g} * e^{it|\cdot|^2} f)(\xi) d\eta \right|^2 dt d\xi &= \int f(\eta) \bar{f}(\lambda) \bar{g}(\eta) g(\lambda) \frac{d\eta d\lambda}{2|\eta-\lambda|}, \end{aligned}$$

from which the result follows whenever f and g have disjoint compact support. $\square$

After these preliminaries, we can proceed with our main result in the case where $s \geq \frac{1}{4}$.

THEOREM 3 *Let $u_0 \in B_2^{\frac{1}{4},1}$. Then there exists a local in time solution $u \in C[-T, T]; B_2^{\frac{1}{4},1}$ to (1.1), which is unique provided that*

$$(2.13) \quad u \in B_\infty^{\frac{3}{4},1}(\mathcal{L}_t^2) \cap B_4^{0,1}(\mathcal{L}_t^\infty) \cap X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}.$$

Moreover the map $S(t) : u_0 \rightarrow u$ is continuous from the ball

$$B(0, R) = \{u_0 \in B_2^{\frac{1}{4},1}; \|u_0\|_{B_2^{\frac{1}{4},1}} \leq R\}$$

to the space

$$\mathcal{L}_t^\infty(B_2^{\frac{1}{4},1}) \cap \mathcal{L}_t^4(B_\infty^{\frac{1}{4},1}) \cap B_\infty^{\frac{3}{4},1}(\mathcal{L}_t^2) \cap B_4^{0,1}(\mathcal{L}_t^\infty) \cap X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}.$$

Furthermore, we have propagation of regularity.

THEOREM 4 *if $u_0 \in H^\sigma$, $\sigma > \frac{1}{4}$, then $S(t)u_0 \in C((-T, T); H^\sigma)$ and*

$$\sup_{t \in (-T, T)} \|S(t)u_0\|_{H^\sigma} \leq C(\|u_0\|_{B_2^{\frac{1}{4}, 1}}) \|u_0\|_{H^\sigma}.$$

In particular, when $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$, the flow map is defined for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and we have a global bound on the $H^{\frac{1}{2}}$ norm.

The uniqueness part of Theorem 3 relies on estimates which are of independent interest when studying the regularity of the flow map.

THEOREM 5 *Let u and $\tilde{u}$ be two solutions to (1.1) verifying (2.13). Then There exist $T > 0$ (depending on the size in $B_2^{1/4, 1}$ of $u_0, \tilde{u}_0$) such that we have*

$$(2.14) \quad \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{C_t(B_2^{-\frac{1}{2}, 1})} \leq C(u_0, \tilde{u}_0) \|u_0 - \tilde{u}_0\|_{B_2^{-\frac{1}{2}, 1}}$$

$$(2.15) \quad \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{X_T^{-\frac{3}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}} \leq C(u_0, \tilde{u}_0) \|u_0 - \tilde{u}_0\|_{B_2^{-\frac{1}{4}, 1}}$$

which implies uniqueness; moreover, the flow map is $C^{\frac{1}{4}}$ from L^2 to $X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$ and $C^{\frac{1}{3}}$ from L^2 to $C_t(L^2)$.

We proceed with statements for the $0 < s < \frac{1}{8}$ range.

THEOREM 6 *Let $u_0 \in B_2^{s, 1}$, $s > 0$. There exists a local in time solution $u \in C[-T, T]; B_2^{\sigma, 1}$ to (1.1), and the flow map is continuous as in Theorem 3. Moreover, uniqueness holds when*

$$(2.16) \quad u \in B_\infty^{\frac{13}{20}, 1}(\mathcal{L}_t^2) \cap B_4^{-\frac{1}{10}, 1}(\mathcal{L}_t^\infty) \cap X^{-\frac{1}{10}, \frac{1}{2}, 1} \cap X^{0, \frac{1}{4}, 1}.$$

We make a few remarks before proceeding with the proofs. The Benjamin-Ono equation (1.1) is invariant under rescaling: if $u(x, t)$ is a solution,

$$u_\lambda = \lambda u(\lambda x, \lambda^2 t)$$

is a solution for any $\lambda > 0$. As such, the scale-invariant Sobolev norm is $\dot{H}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, and consequently, we are in a subcritical situation w.r.t. scaling. For example, $\|u_\lambda\|_2 = \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u\|_2$; if u has lifespan T , u_λ will have lifespan $\lambda^{-2}T$. Therefore, local in time existence can be reduced to time $O(1)$ existence for small data, provided we work with subcritical norms, by taking $\lambda = \varepsilon$. Note that

$$\|u_\varepsilon\|_{\dot{B}_2^s} \sim \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}+s}.$$

In the supercritical setting, i.e. $u_0 \in H^s$ with $s < -\frac{1}{2}$, one may prove (1.1) to be ill-posed in the Hadamard sense, see [4].

3 Gauge and conormal spaces

Suppose we have a smooth solution u to (1.1). One would like to obtain an a priori estimate on u in $Y^{\frac{1}{4}} \cap X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$, where we set

$$(3.1) \quad Y^s = \mathcal{L}_t^\infty(B_1^{s, 2}) \cap \mathcal{L}_t^4(B_\infty^{s, 1}) \cap B_\infty^{s+\frac{1}{2}, 1}(\mathcal{L}_t^2) \cap B_4^{s-\frac{1}{4}, 1}(\mathcal{L}_t^\infty),$$

and emphasize the embedding $X^{s, \frac{1}{2}, 1} \hookrightarrow Y^s$ (Proposition 2.7). Observe that we will mainly use $s = \frac{1}{4}$, and that while we seek $u \in Y^{\frac{1}{4}}$, in the conormal spaces, u will be only $X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$. This $\frac{1}{4}$ loss is a side effect of a gauge transform: due to the “bad” term $T_u \partial_x u$ in the nonlinearity, we need to renormalize, setting

$$w^\pm = T_{\exp \mp \frac{i}{2} \int^x u} u^\pm,$$

where the antiderivative of u , $\int^x u = U(t, x)$ is defined as follows : Consider $\Psi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\int \Psi(y) dy = 1$ and define

$$U(t, x) = \int_y \Psi(y) \int_y^x u(t, z) dz dy + G(t)$$

with G to be fixed later. Obviously

$$\partial_x U(t, x) = \int_y \Psi(y) u(t, x) dy = u(t, x)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t U(t, x) &= \int_y \Psi(y) \int_y^x \partial_t u(t, z) dz dy + G'(t) \\ (3.2) \quad &= \int_y \Psi(y) \int_y^x -H \partial_z^2 u(t, z) - \frac{1}{2} \partial_z (u^2(t, z)) dz dy + G'(t) \\ &= -H \partial_x u(t, x) - \frac{1}{2} u^2(t, x) + \int_y \left(H \Psi'(y) - \frac{1}{2} \Psi(y) \right) u(t, y) dy + G'(t). \end{aligned}$$

Now we choose

$$G(t) = \int_{s=0}^t \int_y \left(-H \Psi'(y) + \frac{1}{2} \Psi(y) \right) u(s, y) dy ds$$

so that

$$(3.3) \quad \partial_t U(t, x) = -H \partial_x u(t, x) - \frac{1}{2} u^2(t, x).$$

Remark that the construction of the anti derivative of u makes sense for $u \in L_{x, \text{tloc}}^2$.

One has to deal with the imaginary exponential and the $X^{s, \theta, 1}$ spaces. There will be several terms which involve both, and a typical one would be (where $\phi^+ = P^+ \phi$ is the projection on $\{\xi > 0\}$)

$$T_{\exp(i \int^x u)} \phi^+,$$

where ϕ may be the nonlinear term in the new unknown, say $\phi^+ = P^+(\partial_x v^- v^+)$, or simply $\phi \in X^{s, b, 1}$. As such, one has to consider the following situation:

$$\phi \in X_+^{s, \pm \frac{1}{2}, 1} \text{ and } u \in X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}.$$

The key idea is that we may be able to perform this (para)-product at the cost of a $\frac{1}{4}$ spatial derivative. Hence, if one is looking for the gauged function $v \in X_T^{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$, inverting the gauge transform yields $u \in X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$, and closing a nonlinear estimate in v requires the estimate which follows.

PROPOSITION 3.1 *Let $u \in X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$ be a solution of (1.1). Denote by K the operator of para-multiplication by $e^{i \int^x u}$, and let $0 < b < 1$. Then K maps $X_{+, T}^{s, \pm b, 1}$ to $X_{+, T}^{s - \frac{b}{2}, \pm b, 1}$ with norm smaller than*

$$C(1 + \|u\|_{X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}}).$$

REMARK 3.2 As will be clear from the proof, this result above extends to the case where u is a finite sum of solutions of (1.1). The result extends as well to the composition of several such paraproducts (i.e. we lose $b/2$ of a derivatives once and for all) or more generally to operators of the following kind

$$w \mapsto \sum_j S_{j-2}(e^{i \int^x u_1}) S_{j-2}(e^{i \int^x u_2}) \Delta_j w$$

with a bound

$$C(1 + \|u_1\|_{X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}})(1 + \|u_2\|_{X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}})$$

where u_1, u_2 are two solutions of (1.1). This fact will be of importance in the proof of uniqueness (see section 5).

We first remark that the para product preserves the ξ localization. As a consequence, by interpolation the result reduces to proving the following two cases:

- First, K maps $X_{+,T}^{s,0,q}$ to $X_{+,T}^{s,0,q}$ given the exponential factor is imaginary, hence bounded (notice we do not use any other information in this case: the continuity constant is $O(1)$).
- Second, K maps $X_{+,T}^{s,1,2}$ to $X_{+,T}^{s,1,2}$, with $q = 1, \infty$.

Indeed, if these two points are proven, then, to recover all cases $1 \leq q \leq +\infty$, it suffices to use the classical interpolation result (see [2, Theorem 5.6.1])

LEMMA 3.3 Let A be a Banach spaces and $l_q^s(A)$ be the space of sequences $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\|(a_n)\|_{l_q^s(A)} = \left(\sum_n (2^{sn} \|a_n\|_A)^q \right)^{1/q} < +\infty$$

Then for any $s_0 \neq s_1$, $0 < q_{0,1,2} \leq +\infty$, $s = \theta s_0 + (1 - \theta)s_1$ the real interpolation spaces satisfy

$$(l_{q_0}^{s_0}(A), l_{q_1}^{s_1}(A))_{\theta, q_2} = l_{q_2}^s(A)$$

In fact we frequently use the following (easier)

LEMMA 3.4 Let l_q^s be the space of complex valued sequences $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$|(a_n)|_{l_q^s(A)} = \left(\sum_n (2^{sn} |a_n|)^q \right)^{1/q} < +\infty$$

Then for any $s_0 < s = \theta s_0 + (1 - \theta)s_1 < s_1$, and any sequence (a_n) in $l_\infty^{s_0} \cap l_\infty^{s_1}$,

$$\|(a_n)\|_{l_1^s} \leq \|(a_n)\|_{l_\infty^{s_0}}^\theta \|(a_n)\|_{l_\infty^{s_1}}^{(1-\theta)}$$

(we exchange l^∞ bound for l^1 summability).

Proof: We have

$$|a_n| \leq 2^{ns_j} \|(a_n)\|_{l_\infty^{s_j}}$$

and to estimate $\sum_n |a_n| 2^{ns}$, we use the s_0 bound to bound the sum for $n \leq N$ and the s_1 bound for the sum for $n > N$ and optimize on N . $\square$

The second point is the most difficult one and we proceed with it. In fact, we only deal with the case $q = 2$ and recover the other cases by (yet another) interpolation. Notice also that due to the para-product structure, the spatial regularity is irrelevant (and we shall fix it to $s = 0$). Consequently, it suffices to work at fixed j . Finally, we first prove a global (i.e. without the index T) version of the estimate (assuming that the functions are compactly supported in $(-2T, 2T)$), the local estimate follows by a limiting procedure. We consider $S_{j-1}(e^{if^x u})\Delta_j(\phi)$ and apply the Schrödinger operator,

$$(i\partial_t - \partial_x^2)(S_{j-1}(e^{if^x u})\Delta_j(\phi)) = F_1 + F_2,$$

with

$$F_1 = (i\partial_t - \partial_x^2)(S_{j-1}(e^{if^x u}))\Delta_j(\phi) + S_{j-1}(e^{if^x u})(i\partial_t - \partial_x^2)\Delta_j(\phi),$$

and

$$F_2 = -2\partial_x S_{j-1}(e^{if^x u})\partial_x \Delta_j(\phi) = -2iS_{j-1}(e^{if^x u}u)\Delta_j(\partial_x \phi).$$

We estimate all these terms in L^2 , knowing $\phi \in X^{0,1,2}$. The last term in F_1 is trivially ok: we control it by the norm of $(i\partial_t - \partial_x^2)\Delta_j(\phi)$ in L^2 . To deal with the first term, one simply recall the definition of $\int^x u$ and due to (3.3), we can replace $\partial_t \int^x u$ by $-H\partial_x u - \frac{1}{2}u^2$. As a consequence, the first term in F_1 is equal to

$$T_{e^{if^x u}(\frac{3u^2}{2} + (H-i)\partial_x u)}\phi.$$

This procedure yields two terms: the first one, namely $S_{j-1}(u^2 e^{if^x u})\Delta_j(\phi)$, is cubic, and by Strichartz inequality (2.9), we get u^2 in $L_t^4(L_x^2)$ and ϕ in $L_t^4(L_x^\infty)$. Hence, the contribution of this term is bounded by

$$\|u\|_{L_t^\infty(L_x^2)}\|u\|_{L_t^4(L_x^\infty)}\|\Delta_j(\phi)\|_{L_t^4(L_x^\infty)} \lesssim \|u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}}^2 \|\Delta_j \Phi\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}}.$$

The other term is equal to $S_{j-1}((H-i)\partial_x u e^{if^x u})\Delta_j(\phi)$. Thus, it is essentially the same thing as F_2 , except for the distribution of derivatives; given the paraproduct structure, it will be easier to deal with than F_2 , and consequently we shall focus only on F_2 . We have

$$(3.4) \quad S_{j-1}(e^{if^x u}u)\Delta_j\partial_x \phi = e^{if^x u}S_{j-1}u\Delta_j\phi + ([S_{j-1}, e^{if^x u}]u)\Delta_j\partial_x \phi.$$

The first term is the main one, we simply use (2.11) to deal with this term and obtain

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \|e^{if^x u}S_{j-1}u\Delta_j\partial_x \phi\|_{L_{t,x}^2} &= \|S_{j-1}u\Delta_j\partial_x \phi\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}} 2^{-\frac{j}{2}} \|\Delta_j \phi\|_{X^{1,\frac{1}{2},1}} \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}} 2^{\frac{j}{2}} \|\Delta_j \phi\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}} \end{aligned}$$

which yields the $1/4$ loss in Proposition 3.1. For the remaining commutator, we use the following classical lemma:

LEMMA 3.5 *Let $f \in L^p$, $\nabla g \in L^\infty$, then*

$$(3.6) \quad \|[S_j, g]f\|_p \lesssim 2^{-j} \|\nabla g\|_\infty \|f\|_p.$$

We provide the (trivial) proof for sake of completeness: given $S_j f = 2^{nj} \phi(2^j \cdot) \star f$, one writes

$$\begin{aligned} [S_j, g]f(x) &= \int 2^{nj} \phi(2^j(x-y))(g(y) - g(x))f(y)dy \\ |[S_j, g]f(x)| &\leq \int 2^{nj} |\phi(2^j(x-y))| |x-y| \|\nabla g\|_\infty |f|(y)dy, \\ &\leq 2^{-j} \|\nabla g\|_\infty \int 2^{nj} \theta(2^j(x-y)) |f|(y)dy, \\ \|\Delta_j, g\|_p &\leq 2^{-j} \|\nabla g\|_\infty \|\theta\|_1 \|f\|_p, \end{aligned}$$

since $\theta(x) = |x| |\phi|(x) \in L^1$. $\square$

Hence, this term is treated using Strichartz estimate (2.9), exactly as the cubic terms above, namely

$$\begin{aligned} \|([S_{j-1}, e^{i \int^x u}] \Delta_j \partial_x \phi)\|_{L_{t,x}^2} &\lesssim 2^{-j} \|u e^{i \int^x u}\|_{L_t^4(L_x^\infty)} \|u\|_{L_t^\infty(L_x^2)} 2^j \|\Delta_j \phi\|_{L_t^4(L_x^\infty)} \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}}^2 \|\Delta_j \phi\|_{X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Collecting all the estimates yields

$$\|(i\partial_t - \partial_x^2) \left(S_{j-1}(e^{i \int^x u}) \Delta_j(\phi) \right)\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \lesssim (1 + \|u\|_{X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}}^2) 2^{\frac{j}{2}} \|\Delta_j \phi\|_{X^{0, 1, 2}},$$

given the embedding $X^{0, 1, 2} \hookrightarrow X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$ (at fixed j). Therefore,

$$\|S_{j-1}(e^{i \int^x u}) \Delta_j(\phi)\|_{X^{0, 1, 2}} \lesssim 2^{\frac{j}{2}} (1 + \|u\|_{X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}}^2) \|\Delta_j \phi\|_{X^{0, 1, 2}}.$$

On the other hand, we clearly have

$$\|S_{j-1}(e^{i \int^x u}) \Delta_j(\phi)\|_{L_{t,x}^2} = \|S_{j-1}(e^{i \int^x u}) \Delta_j(\phi)\|_{X^{0, 0, 2}} \lesssim \|\Delta_j \phi\|_{X^{0, 0, 2}}.$$

We can now decompose all terms according to the conormal scale (k) and by real interpolation on these k sequences get

$$\|S_{j-1}(e^{i \int^x u}) \Delta_j(\phi)\|_{X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, q}} \lesssim 2^{\frac{j}{4}} (1 + \|u\|_{X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}}) \|\Delta_j \phi\|_{X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, q}},$$

which, after summing in j , is the desired result: namely, for any $1 \leq q \leq +\infty$, K maps $X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, q}$ to $X^{-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, q}$. We now have to show that this result still hold with the local in time Bourgain spaces $X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}, q}$ to $X_T^{-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, q}$. For this we come back to (3.10) and replace all occurrences in the right hand side of w and u respectively by u^n and w^n where these sequences are minimizing sequences for Definition 2.5. Now we define $\tilde{u}_j^n$ to be equal to the (new) left hand side. Obviously, $\tilde{u}^n = \sum_j \tilde{u}_j^n$ is equal to u on $[0, T]$ and applying the (global) estimate we just got yields

$$\begin{aligned} (3.7) \quad \|\tilde{u}^n\|_{X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}} &\lesssim (1 + \|u^n\|_{X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}}) \|w^n\|_{X^{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}} + \|u^n\|_{X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}}^2 + \|u_0\|_{L_x^2} \|u^n\|_{\mathcal{L}_t^4(B_\infty^{\frac{1}{4}, 1})} \\ &\quad + \|u_0\|_{L_x^2} (\|u^n\|_{X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}} + 1) \|u^n\|_{X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

We shall also need to “invert” the estimates in Proposition 3.1:

PROPOSITION 3.6 *Let $u \in X_T^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$ be a solution of (1.1). Let w be defined (as a real valued function) by*

$$w = w^+ + w^-, w^\pm = P^\pm S_0 u + \sum_{j \geq 0} w_j^\pm, \quad w_j^\pm = S_{j-1}(e^{\mp \frac{i}{2} \int^x u}) \Delta_j^\pm u.$$

Then we have

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \|u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}} &\lesssim (1 + \|u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}}) \|w\|_{X^{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{2},1}} + \|u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}}^2 + \|u_0\|_{L_x^2} \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_t^4(B_\infty^{\frac{1}{4},1})} \\ &\quad + \|u_0\|_{L_x^2} (\|u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}} + 1) \|u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}}. \end{aligned}$$

The low frequency part is a trivial issue. As before, let us first prove the estimate in global spaces. Let us focus on the high frequencies : from now on, denote by $F = \exp(i \int^x u)$. We write

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} w_j^+ &= S_{j-1} F \Delta_j u^+ \\ &= F \Delta_j u^+ + \sum_{k \geq j-1} \Delta_k(F) \Delta_j u^+ \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta_j u^+ &= F^{-1} w_j^+ - F^{-1} \sum_{k \geq j-1} \Delta_k(F) \Delta_j u^+ \\ &= S_{j-3}(F^{-1}) w_j^+ + \sum_{k \geq j-3} \Delta_k(F^{-1}) w_j^+ - F^{-1} \sum_{k \geq j-1} \Delta_k(F) \Delta_j u^+ \\ &= S_{j-3}(F^{-1}) w_j^+ + \tilde{\Delta}_j \left(\sum_{k \sim j} \Delta_k(F^{-1}) w_j^+ \right) - \tilde{\Delta}_j \left(F^{-1} \sum_{k \geq j-1} \Delta_k(F) \Delta_j u^+ \right), \end{aligned}$$

due to the frequency localization of w_j^+ , with $\tilde{\Delta}_j$ an enlargement of Δ_j ; the first term is ok according to Proposition 3.1 (where, obviously, the sign of the phase term is irrelevant). We now proceed with the remaining terms, and need to estimate

$$\|\Delta_j u^+ - S_{j-3}(F^{-1}) \Delta_j w^+\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}}.$$

For lack of a better alternative, we proceed as in the proof of Proposition 3.1. On one hand we have (recall $L_{t,x}^2 = X^{0,0,2}$) using (2.9), $T \lesssim 1$, and v being either u or w ,

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\Delta_k F^{\pm 1} \Delta_j v^+\|_{X^{0,0,2}} &\lesssim 2^{-k} \|\Delta_k \partial_x (e^{\mp i \int^x u})\|_{L_t^\infty(L_x^2)} \|\Delta_j v^+\|_{L_T^2(L_x^\infty)} \\ &\lesssim 2^{-k} \|u e^{\mp i \int^x u}\|_{L_t^\infty(L_x^2)} \|\Delta_j v^+\|_{L_t^4(L_x^\infty)} \leq 2^{-k} \|u_0\|_{L^2} \|\Delta_j v\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}} \end{aligned}$$

and consequently (notice the spatial regularity gain !)

$$(3.12) \quad \|\Delta_j u^+ - S_{j-3}(F^{-1}) \Delta_j w^+\|_{X^{1,0,2}} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{L^2} (\|\Delta_j w\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}} + \|\Delta_j u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}}).$$

On the other hand we compute

$$(3.13) \quad \|(\partial_t + H \partial_x^2)(\Delta_j u^+ - S_{j-3}(F^{-1}) \Delta_j w^+)\|_{X^{0,0,2}},$$

for which we proceed differently: given we are on $\xi > 0$ as well, we may use the equation for the first term and a computation similar to the proof of Proposition 3.1 for the paraproduct. Obviously, we have

$$\|(\partial_t + H \partial_x^2) \Delta_j u^+\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \lesssim 2^j \|\Delta_j^+(u^2)\|_{L_{t,x}^2},$$

and using a paraproduct decomposition for u^2 and $T \lesssim 1$,

$$\|(\partial_t + H \partial_x^2) \Delta_j u^+\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \lesssim 2^j (2^{-\frac{j}{2}} \|u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}}^2 + 2^{-\frac{j}{4}} \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_t^4(B_\infty^{\frac{1}{4},1})} \|u_0\|_{L_x^2}).$$

REMARK 3.7 *One could deal with the remainder term differently and estimate it only with $X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}$ norms: due to support conditions, only opposite frequencies interactions occur, for which one may use the smoothing effect as on the paraproduct terms.*

The paraproduct term in (3.13) requires distributing the $i\partial_t - \partial_x^2$ operator:

- first, on the exponential factor, using the equation on u and $F^{-1}\partial_x u = \partial_x(uF^{-1}) - u\partial_x F^{-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_{j-3}((i\partial_t - \partial_x^2)F^{-1})\Delta_j w^+\|_{L_{t,x}^2} &\lesssim \|S_{j-3}(F^{-1}u^2)\Delta_j w^+\|_{L_{t,x}^2} + \|S_{j-3}\partial_x(F^{-1}u)\Delta_j w^+\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \\ &\lesssim \|u_0\|_{L^2}\|u\|_{L_t^4(L_x^\infty)}\|\Delta_j w\|_{L_t^4(L_x^\infty)} + 2^j\|u\|_{L_t^\infty(L_x^2)}\|\Delta_j w^+\|_{L_t^4(L_x^\infty)} \\ &\lesssim \|u_0\|_{L^2}\|u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}}\|w_j\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}} + 2^j\|u_0\|_{L^2}\|w_j\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}}. \end{aligned}$$

- For the next term, we use the (algebraic) computation (4.4) from the next section to remark that w^+ satisfies an equation which is no worse than u , hence, discarding the exponential factor,

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_{j-3}(F^{-1})\Delta_j(\partial_t + H\partial_x^2)w^+\|_{L_{t,x}^2} &\lesssim \|\Delta_j\partial_x(u^2)\|_{L_{t,x}^2} + \|S_{j-1}\partial_x(Fu)u_j^+\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \\ &\quad + \|S_{j-1}(Fu^2)u_j^+\|_{L_{t,x}^2} + \|S_{j-1}(Fu)\partial_x u_j^+\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \\ &\lesssim 2^j(2^{-\frac{j}{2}}\|u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}}^2 + 2^{-\frac{j}{4}}\|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_t^4(B_\infty^{\frac{1}{4},1})}\|u_0\|_{L_x^2}) \\ &\quad + 2^j\|u\|_{L_t^\infty(L_x^2)}\|u_j^+\|_{L_T^4(L_x^\infty)} \\ &\quad + \|u\|_{L_t^\infty(L_x^2)}\|u\|_{L_t^4(L_x^\infty)}\|u_j^+\|_{L_t^4(L_x^\infty)} \\ &\lesssim 2^j(2^{-\frac{j}{2}}\|u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}}^2 + 2^{-\frac{j}{4}}\|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_t^4(B_\infty^{\frac{1}{4},1})}\|u_0\|_{L_x^2}) \\ &\quad + \|u_0\|_{L^2}(2^j + \|u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}})\|u_j\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}}. \end{aligned}$$

- Finally, the last term comes from distributing the laplacian,

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \|S_{j-3}(\partial_x F^{-1})\Delta_j\partial_x w_j^+\|_{L_{t,x}^2} &\lesssim 2^j\|S_{j-3}(F^{-1}u)\|_{L_t^\infty(L_x^2)}\|\Delta_j w^+\|_{L_T^2(L_x^\infty)} \\ &\lesssim 2^j\|u_0\|_{L^2}\|\Delta_j w\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Collecting all terms

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\Delta_j u^+ - S_{j-3}(F^{-1})w_j^+\|_{X^{0,1,2}} &\lesssim 2^j \left(2^{-\frac{j}{4}}(\|u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}}^2 + \|u_0\|_{L_x^2}\|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_t^4(B_\infty^{\frac{1}{4},1})}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|u_0\|(\|u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}} + 1)(\|w_j\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}} + \|u_j\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Hölder for k -sequences,

$$\|f\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}} \leq (\|f\|_{X^{0,0,2}}\|f\|_{X^{0,1,2}})^{1/2}$$

and we obtain from (3.12) and (3.15)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_j u^+ - S_{j-3}(F^{-1})\Delta_j w^+\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}} &\lesssim 2^{-\frac{j}{4}}(\|u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}}^2 + \|u_0\|_{L_x^2}\|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_t^4(B_\infty^{\frac{1}{4},1})}) \\ &\quad + \|u_0\|(\|u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}} + 1)(\|w_j\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}} + \|u_j\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}}). \end{aligned}$$

Summing over j provides our estimate. $\square$

Next we can obtain similar results for any L^p, L^q norm, but without any spatial regularity loss:

PROPOSITION 3.8 For any mixed $L^p L^q$ norm (independently of the order (t, x) or (x, t)), we have

$$(3.16) \quad (1 - \|u_0\|_2) \|u_j\|_{L^p L^q} \leq \|w_j\|_{L^p L^q} \leq \|u_j\|_{L^p L^q},$$

and consequently

$$(3.17) \quad (1 - \|u_0\|_2) \|u\|_{Y^s} \leq \|w\|_{Y^s} \leq \|u\|_{Y^s}.$$

REMARK 3.9 As the proof below shows, the result still hold if the renormalization is performed using another solution of (1.1) (or a sum of such solutions)

Proof: Recall

$$\begin{aligned} w_j^+ &= F_{\prec j} u_j^+, \\ w_j^+ &= F u_j^+ + \sum_{k>j} (\Delta_k F) u_j^+, \\ u_j^+ &= F^{-1} w_j^+ - \sum_{k>j} F^{-1} (\Delta_k F) u_j^+. \end{aligned}$$

Write

$$\|u_j\|_{L^p L^q} \leq \|w_j\|_{L^p L^q} + \sum_{k>j} \|\Delta_k(F) u_j\|_{L^p L^q},$$

together with

$$\|\Delta_k F\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \lesssim 2^{-k} \|\Delta_k \partial_x F\|_\infty \lesssim 2^{-k} \|\Delta_k(uF)\|_\infty \lesssim 2^{-\frac{k}{2}} \|u\|_{L_t^\infty(L_x^2)} \lesssim 2^{-\frac{k}{2}} \|u_0\|_{L_x^2},$$

we obtain the desired control. $\square$

REMARK 3.10 The $1/4$ loss in the gauge transformation, when $b = \frac{1}{2}$, is responsible for the $s > 1/4$ assumption in our main Theorem. Further computations suggest that this loss in the gauge transform is unavoidable with the rather crude method we developed here. The improvements over $s = \frac{1}{4}$ utilize the lesser $\frac{1}{8}$ loss which occurs when dealing with the $b = \frac{1}{4}$ case.

4 Existence

We now come back to considering a smooth solution u to (1.1). From the renormalization estimates, we know that, provided we can estimate $w \in X^{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$, we will have $u \in X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$ by using the gauge estimate proved earlier, and moreover, u in some $L^p L^q$ space is equivalent to the same properties on w .

In the sequel we shall adopt the following convention. For w a (smooth) function, we shall denote by $w_{\prec j}$ any term obtained by applying to w a spectral cut-off supported in the set $|\xi| \leq 2^{j-K}$ for a sufficiently large (but fixed) K . We shall also denote by $w_{\sim j}$ any term obtained by applying to w a spectral cut-off supported in the set $2^{j-N} \leq |\xi| \leq 2^{j+N}$ for a sufficiently large (but fixed) N . If the cut of is supported in the set where $\pm \xi \geq 0$ then we will denote the result by $u_j^\pm$. The convention will be taken that if we write $v_{\prec j} w_j$ we have chosen $N \leq K - 3$ so that this expression is still localized in the set $|\xi| \sim 2^j$.

The main result in this section is the following.

THEOREM 7 *Let u be a solution to (1.1) verifying (2.13), and w defined by Proposition 3.6, with small $\|u_0\|_{L_x^2}$. Then we have (if $\|u_0\|_{B_2^{\frac{1}{4},1}}$ is small enough)*

$$(4.1) \quad \|w\|_{X_{T=1}^{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{2},1}} \lesssim \|w_0\|_{B_2^{\frac{1}{4},1}} + \|u\|_{X_{T=1}^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}} \|w\|_{X_{T=1}^{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{2},1}} + (1 + \|u\|_{X_{T=1}^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}}) \|w\|_{X_{T=1}^{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{2},1}}^2 \\ + \|u\|_{Y^{\frac{1}{4}}}^3 + \|u\|_{Y^{\frac{1}{4}}}^2 \|w\|_{Y^{\frac{1}{4}}} + \|w\|_{X_{T=1}^{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{2},1}}^3.$$

Proof: Once again, the low frequencies ($|\xi| \lesssim 1$) is a trivial issue: the derivative in the nonlinearity vanishes and one may use, say, Strichartz to estimate the quadratic term. We proceed with higher frequencies, and accordingly will sum only over $j \geq 0$. We begin by a parilinearization of the equation, starting with

$$(4.2) \quad \Delta_j^+(u^2) = \Delta_j^+(2 \sum_{k \sim j} 2S_{k-1}u \Delta_k u + \sum_{j \lesssim k \sim k'} u_k u_{k'}) \\ = \Delta_j^+(2S_{j-1}u \sum_{k \sim j} \Delta_k u + \sum_{j \lesssim k} u_{\sim k}^2)$$

where the additional terms coming from freezing $k = j$ in the S_{k-1} operator are transferred to the remainder term. Now, taking further advantage of support considerations,

$$(4.3) \quad \partial_x \Delta_j^+(u^2) = 2u_{\prec j} \partial_x u_j^+ + 2[\Delta_j^+, u_{\prec j}] \partial_x u_{\sim j}^+ + 2\Delta_j^+((\partial_x u_{\prec j})u_{\sim j}^+) + \sum_{j \lesssim k} \Delta_j^+ \partial_x (u_{\sim k} u_{\sim k}^+)$$

As a consequence, we can localize equation (1.1),

$$\partial_t u_j^+ - i\partial_x^2 u_j^+ + u_{\prec j} \partial_x u_j^+ = -\Delta_j^+((\partial_x u_{\prec j})u_{\sim j}^+) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \lesssim k} \Delta_j^+ \partial_x (u_{\sim k} u_{\sim k}^+) \\ - [\Delta_j^+, u_{\prec j}] \partial_x u_{\sim j}^+ \\ = f_{j,1} + f_{j,2} + f_{j,3} = f_j^+$$

Recall that w is defined by

$$w_j^+ = S_{j-1}(e^{-\frac{i}{2} \int^x u}) \Delta_j^+(u),$$

which yields the equation on w_j^+ :

$$(4.4) \quad \partial_t w_j^+ - i\partial_x^2 w_j^+ = S_{j-1}(e^{-\frac{i}{2} \int^x u}) f_j^+ + u_j^+ S_{j-1}((\frac{1}{2} H \partial_x u + \frac{1}{4} u^2) e^{-\frac{i}{2} \int^x u}) \\ + \left(S_{j-1}(u e^{-\frac{i}{2} \int^x u}) - S_{j-1} u S_{j-1}(e^{-\frac{i}{2} \int^x u}) \right) \partial_x u_j^+.$$

The origin of the second term is clear: it comes from the linear operator hitting the exponential factor: we use (3.3) to exchange time derivatives for space derivatives. Note that the u^2 term is really cubic, hence it will be easier to deal with. The last term and the $H \partial_x u$ term are, up to commutators, $w_j \partial_x u_{\prec j}$. We will see when dealing with f_j that we also get a term like this and a whole set of commutation terms which are supposed to be “better” in that they require no conormal spaces to deal with them.

Heuristically, when summing over j , we have eliminated (up to commutators !) the worse term, namely $T_u \partial_x u$, and are left with $T_{\partial_x u} w$: but from the product rules in the Appendix,

$$\|T_{\partial_x u} w\|_{X_{T=1}^{\frac{1}{4},-\frac{1}{2},1}} \lesssim \|u\|_{X_{T=1}^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}} \|w\|_{X_{T=1}^{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{2},1}},$$

which will be ok to close the estimate.

We now proceed with estimating all right-handside terms in (4.4) in the space $X_{T=1}^{\frac{1}{4}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$. This term has the form $F(u, w, \partial_x u, \partial_x w)$. To make the exposition more clear, we shall in a first step proceed as if w were in $X^{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$ (the global Bourgain space) and estimate the right hand side in $X^{\frac{1}{4}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$ (and u in $X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1} \cap Y^{\frac{1}{4}}$). We shall give at the end of the section the modifications required to handle the argument.

- We first deal with the ones coming from the exponentiation/paraproduct, starting with $P_1 = u_j^+ S_{j-1}(e^{-\frac{i}{2} \int^x u} H \partial_x u)$. Denoting (again) by $F = e^{-\frac{i}{2} \int^x u}$, we have

$$(4.5) \quad P_1 = u_j^+ F_{\prec j} H \partial_x u_{\prec j} + u_j^+ [S_{j-1}, F_{\prec j}] H \partial_x u_{\prec j} + u_j^+ S_{j-1} \left(\sum_{j \lesssim k} F_{\sim k} H \partial_x u_{\sim k} \right) \\ + u_j^+ S_{j-1} (F_{\sim j} S_{j-1} H \partial_x u + F_{\prec j} H \partial_x u_{\sim j})$$

because the other terms vanish by support considerations. The contribution to the RHS of (4.4) of the first of these terms (which is nothing but $w_j^+ H \partial_x u_{\prec j}$) is estimated by conormal product laws (A.13) ($T_{X^{-1, \frac{1}{2}, 1}} : X^{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, 1} \mapsto X^{\frac{1}{4}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$), noticing that the Hilbert transform is harmless with conormal spaces (which depend only on the size of the Fourier transform).

Terms which have high frequencies of F will be “cubic”: heuristically,

$$\Delta_k(e^{-\frac{i}{2} \int^x u}) = F_k \approx 2^{-k} \partial_x(F_k) \approx 2^{-k} \Delta_k(uF),$$

hence we have

$$\|F_k\|_{L_x^4(L_t^\infty)} \leq 2^{-k} \|u\|_{L_x^4(L_t^\infty)}.$$

Pick the third term in (4.5), call it G_3 , we use

$$\|\partial_x u_k\|_{L_x^\infty L_t^2} \leq 2^{\frac{k}{4}} \eta_k \|u\|_{B_{\infty}^{\frac{3}{4}, 1}(\mathcal{L}_t^2)},$$

with $\sum_j \eta_j \lesssim 1$, $(\eta_j)_j$ a generic sequence which may change from line to line, and

$$\|u_j^+\|_{L_x^4 L_t^\infty} \leq \|u\|_{L_x^4(L_t^\infty)},$$

to get

$$\|G_3\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \lesssim 2^{-\frac{3}{4}j} \eta_j \|u\|_{L_x^4(L_t^\infty)}^2 \|u\|_{B_{\infty}^{\frac{3}{4}, 1}(\mathcal{L}_t^2)},$$

which means the sum over j is in $X^{\frac{3}{4}, 0, \infty} \hookrightarrow X^{\frac{1}{4}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$ which is ok. This “trick” of estimating F_k for $k \geq j$ by $2^{-k} \partial_x F_k$ yielding another factor u will be used several times in the sequel and such terms will be referred as “cubic terms”.

The next term we dispose of is $G_2 = u_j^+ [S_{j-1}, F_{\prec j}] H \partial_x u_{\prec j}$: in a similar way,

$$\|G_2\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \lesssim \|u_j^+\|_{L_t^\infty(L_x^2)} 2^{-j} \|u\|_{L_t^4(L_x^\infty)} \|H \partial_x u_{\prec j}\|_{L_t^4(L_x^\infty)} \\ \lesssim \eta_j \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_t^\infty(B_2^{\frac{1}{4}, 1})} \|u\|_{X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}} \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}_t^4(B_\infty^{\frac{1}{4}, 1})} 2^{-\frac{j}{2}},$$

which again means the sum over j to be in $X^{\frac{1}{2}, 0, \infty} \hookrightarrow X^{\frac{1}{4}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$.

The third term from (4.5) splits into two terms: the first one, which has $F_{\sim j}$, can be treated exactly like the high frequencies interactions, to end up in $X^{\frac{3}{4}, 0, \infty}$. The very last one can be rewritten as

$$u_j^+ S_{j-1} (F_{\prec j} H \partial_x u_{\sim j}) = u_j^+ F_{\prec j} S_{j-1} (H \partial_x u_{\sim j}) + u_j^+ [S_{j-1}, F_{\prec j}] H \partial_x u_{\sim j},$$

which are two terms identical to the very first one and second in (4.5), up to the replacement of $u_{\prec j}$ by respectively $S_{j-1}u_{\sim j}$ and $u_{\sim j}$, which is harmless. To recap,

$$\left\| \sum_j P_1 \right\|_{X^{\frac{1}{4}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}} \lesssim \|w\|_{X^{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}} \|u\|_{X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}} + \|u\|_{X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}} \|u\|_{Y^{\frac{1}{4}}}^2 + \|u\|_{Y^{\frac{1}{4}}}^3.$$

- Term $P_2 = (S_{j-1}(uF) - S_{j-1}uS_{j-1}F)\partial_x u_j^+$: we have

$$(4.6) \quad P_2 = \partial_x u_j^+ [S_{j-1}, F_{\prec j}] u_{\prec j} + \partial_x u_j^+ S_{j-1} \left(\sum_{j \lesssim k} F_{\sim k} u_{\sim k} \right) + \partial_x u_j^+ S_{j-1} (F_{\sim j} S_{j-1} u + F_{\prec j} u_{\sim j})$$

which is essentially the same term as before (summing a 2^{-k} will kill the shifted derivative), and therefore can be estimated in the same way. The only term which requires a slightly different treatment is the very last one, namely

$$P_{24} = \partial_x u_j^+ S_{j-1} (F_{\prec j} u_{\sim j}).$$

Rewrite again

$$\begin{aligned} P_{24} &= \partial_x u_j^+ [S_{j-1}, F_{\prec j}] u_{\sim j} + \partial_x u_j^+ F_{\prec j} S_{j-1} u_{\sim j} \\ &= \partial_x (w_j^+ S_{j-1} u_{\sim j}) - w_j^+ \partial_x S_{j-1} u_{\sim j} - u_j^+ S_{j-1} u_{\sim j} \partial_x F_{\prec j}, \end{aligned}$$

and now the first two terms are ok by conormal product rules (in a sense, they are both high-high frequencies interactions which are already present in the f_j^+ term) and the last one is again cubic.

- We now proceed with the $F_{\prec j} f_j^+$ term: the very first term $F_{\prec j} f_{j,1}$ sums up to $T_{\partial_x u} w$. By using the conormal estimates (A.13), we can estimate the para-product in $X^{\frac{1}{4}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$. The second one is (where we only retain the diagonal term for notational convenience)

$$P_3 = F_{\prec j} \partial_x (\Delta_j \sum_{j \lesssim k} u_k^+ u_k).$$

Again, we would like to have w_k rather than u_k : recall

$$u_k^+ = F^{-1} w_k^+ - F^{-1} \sum_{k \lesssim l} F_l u_k^+.$$

Obviously, the simplest case is when we have $u^+ u^-$, for the F factors cancel (because $\bar{F} = F^{-1}$ as an imaginary exponential) and we obtain

$$P_{31} = F_{\prec j} \partial_x (\Delta_j \sum_{j \lesssim k} w_k^+ w_k^-)$$

as the main term which, using (A.11) and Proposition 3.1, leads to

$$\left\| \sum_j P_{31} \right\|_{X^{\frac{1}{4}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}} \lesssim C(1 + \|u\|_{X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}}) \|w\|_{X^{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}}^2.$$

The other term is

$$P_{32} = F_{\prec j} \partial_x \left(\Delta_j \sum_{j \lesssim k} w_k^+ \left(\sum_{l > k} F_l u_k^- \right) \right),$$

which is obviously cubic and can be dealt with as before, to end up in

$$X^{\frac{3}{4},0,\infty} \hookrightarrow X^{\frac{1}{4},-\frac{1}{2},1}.$$

Let us now study the case when we have u^+u^+ . By support considerations, the only term appearing is

$$F_{\prec j} \partial_x \Delta_j^+(u_{\sim j}^+ u_{\sim j}^+) = \partial_x \left(F_{\prec j} \Delta_j^+(u_{\sim j}^+ u_{\sim j}^+) \right) - (\partial_x F_{\prec j}) \Delta_j^+(u_{\sim j}^+ u_{\sim j}^+)$$

the second term is cubic and can be estimated as before, we only have to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x \left(F_{\prec j} \Delta_j^+(u_{\sim j}^+ u_{\sim j}^+) \right) &= \partial_x \Delta_j^+(F_{\prec j} u_{\sim j}^+ u_{\sim j}^+) + \partial_x \left([F_{\prec j}, \Delta_j^+](u_{\sim j}^+ u_{\sim j}^+) \right), \\ &= \partial_x \Delta_j^+(w_{\sim j}^+ u_{\sim j}^+) + \partial_x \left(\Delta_j^+(F_{\prec j} u_{\sim j}^+ u_{\sim j}^+) + [F_{\prec j}, \Delta_j^+](u_{\sim j}^+ u_{\sim j}^+) \right), \end{aligned}$$

for which the second and third terms are, once again, cubic.

Finally, using product law (A.11), the remaining term is estimated in $X^{\frac{1}{4},-\frac{1}{2},1}$.

- Let us finally deal with the commutator which appear in f_j :

$$C_j = F_{\prec j} [\Delta_j^+, u_{\prec j}] \partial_x u_{\sim j}^+.$$

We commute $F_{\prec j}$ to obtain $F_{\prec j} u_{\sim j}^+$ which we know is $w_{\sim j}^+ + F_{\sim j} u_{\sim j}^+$. The contribution of $F_j u_j^+$ will then be cubic, and the additional commutators, namely $[F_{\prec j}, \Delta_j]$ or $[F_{\prec j}, \partial_x]$ all gain regularity and will yield cubic terms. Thus, we are finally left with estimating (at worse !)

$$\tilde{C}_j = [\Delta_j^+, u_{\prec j}] \partial_x w_{\sim j}^+,$$

which we intend to deal with in conormal spaces. Let us postpone the issue and turn to the detail of the cubic terms:

$$\begin{aligned} C_j &= F_{\prec j} \left(\Delta_j^+(u_{\prec j} \partial_x u_{\sim j}^+) - u_{\prec j} \partial_x u_j^+ \right) \\ &= \Delta_j^+(F_{\prec j} u_{\prec j} \partial_x u_{\sim j}^+) - u_{\prec j} F_{\prec j} \partial_x u_j^+ + [F_{\prec j}, \Delta_j^+](u_{\prec j} \partial_x u_{\sim j}^+) \\ &= \Delta_j^+(u_{\prec j} \partial_x (F_{\prec j} u_{\sim j}^+)) - u_{\prec j} \partial_x (F_{\prec j} u_j^+) \\ &\quad - \Delta_j^+(u_{\prec j} (\partial_x F_{\prec j}) u_{\sim j}^+) + u_{\prec j} (\partial_x F_{\prec j}) u_j^+ + [F_{\prec j}, \Delta_j^+](u_{\prec j} \partial_x u_{\sim j}^+) \\ &= [\Delta_j^+, u_{\prec j}] \partial_x w_{\sim j}^+ + \Delta_j^+(u_{\prec j} \partial_x (F_{\sim j} u_{\sim j}^+)) \\ &\quad - \Delta_j^+(u_{\prec j} (\partial_x F_{\prec j}) u_{\sim j}^+) + u_{\prec j} (\partial_x F_{\prec j}) u_j^+ + [F_{\prec j}, \Delta_j^+](u_{\prec j} \partial_x u_{\sim j}^+) \end{aligned}$$

for which the last for terms are cubic. Hence we are left with $\tilde{C}_j$: we will rely on the next lemma, which tells us we really have an harmless variant of $T_{\partial_x u} w$, and we are done.

LEMMA 4.1 *Let us consider G which is spectrally localized at $|\xi| \leq 2^{j-1}$ and F which is spectrally localized at $|\xi| \sim 2^j$. Then one may estimate $[\Delta_j, G] \partial_x F$ in conormal spaces as if it were $(\partial_x G) F$.*

Proof: This will follow from a careful rewriting of the commutator:

$$\begin{aligned} C &= - \int_y 2^j \phi(2^j(x-y))(G(x) - G(y)) \partial_y F(y) dy, \\ &= - \int_0^1 \int_y 2^j(x-y) \phi(2^j(x-y)) G'(y + \theta(x-y)) \partial_y F(y) dy d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

Set $\psi(z) = z\phi(z)$ and $\psi_j(z) = 2^j\psi(2^jz)$, $G' = g$ and $2^-j\partial_x F = f$,

$$C = - \int_0^1 \int_y \psi_j(x-y)g(y+\theta(x-y))f(y) dy d\theta.$$

Let us denote by $I_\theta(x)$ the integral over y , with a fixed θ . By Plancherel, and through changes of variable,

$$\begin{aligned} I_\theta(x) &= \int_{\xi,\eta} e^{ix\xi} \hat{\psi}_j(\xi) e^{i\eta \frac{\theta}{1-\theta}x} \frac{1}{1-\theta} \hat{g}\left(\frac{\eta}{1-\theta}\right) \hat{f}(\xi-\eta) d\eta d\xi, \\ I_\theta(x) &= \int_{\lambda,\mu} e^{ix(\mu+(1-\theta)\lambda+\theta\lambda)} \hat{\psi}_j(\mu+(1-\theta)\lambda) \hat{g}(\lambda) \hat{f}(\mu) d\mu d\lambda, \\ I_\theta(x) &= \int_{\xi,\eta} e^{ix\xi} \hat{\psi}_j(\xi-\eta+(1-\theta)\eta) \hat{g}(\eta) \hat{f}(\xi-\eta) d\eta d\xi, \\ &= \mathcal{F}_\xi^{-1} \left(\int_\eta \psi_j(\xi-\theta\eta) \hat{g}(\eta) \hat{f}(\xi-\eta) d\eta \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $I_\theta(x)$ is the inverse Fourier transform of a restricted convolution between $\hat{g}$ and $\hat{f}$: but all conormal spaces estimates are proven using Plancherel and cutting the Fourier space into carefully chosen blocks: here we only get part of them, as the presence of $\hat{\psi}_j(\xi-\theta\eta)$ reduces the number of situations where the convolution is non zero. Therefore, we can estimate $I_\theta(x)$ as if it were $gf \sim G'F$, independently of θ , which is the desired result. $\square$

Collecting all terms, we obtain that our source term (after summing over j) is controlled in $X^{\frac{1}{4},-\frac{1}{2},1}$ by

$$\|w\|_{X^{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{2},1}} \|u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}} + \|u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}} \|u\|_{Y^{\frac{1}{4}}}^2 + \|u\|_{Y^{\frac{1}{4}}}^3 + (1 + \|u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}}) \|w\|_{X^{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{2},1}}^2 + \|u\|_{Y^{\frac{1}{4}}}^2 \|w\|_{Y^{\frac{1}{4}}}.$$

Using (3.17), and inverting the linear operator, we obtain our a priori estimate. $\square$

This estimate, when combined with Proposition 3.6, yields an a priori bound (for small data) on the norm in $X^{\frac{1}{4},-\frac{1}{2},1}$ of the r.h.s. of (4.4) by

$$\|u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}} \|w\|_{X^{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{2},1}} + (1 + \|u\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}}) \|w\|_{X^{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{2},1}}^2 + \|w\|_{X^{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{2},1}}^3$$

We want local Bourgain spaces instead of global ones (i.e. we want norms in $X_{T=1}^{s,\frac{1}{2},1}$). For this we have to take sequences u_n and w_n with supports in $[-2T, 2T]$ and equal to u and w respectively minimizing (2.7) and define $\tilde{w}_j^+$ to be the solution of the non linear Schrödinger equation with initial data $w_j^+|_{t=0}$ and with a r.h.s obtained by substituting in the r.h.s of (4.4) every occurrence of u by u_n and every occurrence of w by w_n . In fact, in the analysis above, there were also parts of u and w for which we used the classical norms $Y^{\frac{1}{4}}$. In that case we keep u and w in the r.h.s. This means that we make the substitution only on the dyadic parts for which we used $X^{s,\frac{1}{2},1}$ norms. We now remark that $\tilde{w}_j^+ = w_j^+$ for $|t| \leq T$. Passing to the limit $n \rightarrow +\infty$ and using lemma 2.6 gives (4.1).

Remark that several different $X^{s,b,q}$ norms could have been used for the same function u (for which the minimizing sequences can differ). This does not matter, as long as we make the substitution with the sequence corresponding to the norm which is used. This will be used in the uniqueness Theorem.

To prove the existence part of our Theorem for $s > \frac{1}{4}$, we only have to set up a bootstrap argument. Since we have fixed $T = 1$, we can not use any bootstrap on time, but rather will use again the scale non invariance of the L^2 and $H^{1/4}$ spaces: we fix $u_0 \in B_2^{\frac{1}{4},1}$ and consider $u_\lambda = \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} u(\lambda^2 t, \lambda x)$. Then if u is smooth the norm of u_λ and w_λ in the spaces above tend to 0

as λ tends to 0, which allow to apply the usual bootstrap argument. Existence is then obtained through a limiting procedure from smooth solutions (notice that passing to the limit in the equation is trivial, given our a priori control). Finally, continuity of the flow map is a simple consequence of the classical Bona-Smith argument: for example, one can implement it exactly as in [11] and we therefore skip it.

It remains to prove Theorem 4, which is nothing but persistence of regularity. This requires to carefully check that all nonlinear estimates can be rewritten with one factor in $(X_{T=1}^{s,b,2} + X_{T=1}^{s,\frac{1}{2},1}) \cap Y^s$, with $s > \frac{1}{4}$ and $b > \frac{1}{2}$. This is certainly obvious on all cubic terms, and follows from the product rules in the Appendix for quadratic terms. We leave the details to the reader.

5 Uniqueness

We now prove Theorem 5. Suppose we have two solutions u and v to (1.1), such that

$$(5.1) \quad u, v \in Y^{\frac{1}{4}} \cap X_{T=1}^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}.$$

Remark that in order to prove Theorem 5, we can assume that one of the solutions (say, u) is the one we have just constructed (and consequently $T_{e^{\mp \frac{i}{2} \int^x u}} u^\pm = w^\pm$ enjoys better estimates, namely $w \in X_{T=1}^{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{2},1}$). Later, we will use both informations: the $\frac{1}{4}$ regularity and the weaker conormal space. Before proceeding, we shall recall that v (and u) satisfy

$$(5.2) \quad \|v\|_{X^{0,\frac{1}{2},1}} \leq C$$

$$(5.3) \quad \|\Delta_j(v)\|_{L_x^\infty; L_t^2} \leq 2^{-\frac{3}{4}j} c_j, \quad c_j \in l^1$$

$$(5.4) \quad \|\Delta_j(v)\|_{L_x^4; L_t^\infty} \leq c_j \in l^1$$

Furthermore, since u is the solution we just constructed, its renormalized version

$$(5.5) \quad w_j^\pm = S_{j-1}(e^{\mp \frac{i}{2} \int^x u}) \Delta_j^\pm(u).$$

satisfy the additional estimate

$$(5.6) \quad \|w\|_{X^{\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{2},1}} \leq C$$

let us define $\delta = u - v$. Then

$$(5.7) \quad \partial_t \delta + H \partial_x^2 \delta + \frac{1}{2} \partial_x((u+v)\delta) = 0.$$

One would like to obtain an a priori estimate on δ which would imply uniqueness, or, even better, Lipschitz dependence in a possibly weaker norm. However, one cannot proceed directly with this equation, again for the same reasons that required a renormalization procedure: indeed, a typical troublesome term is $2u\partial_x \delta$, or more precisely the paraproduct $T_u \partial_x \delta$.

REMARK 5.1 *One may hope to get away with the problem by using a weaker norm, namely a norm with negative spatial regularity: a good candidate appears to be $X_{T=1}^{-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},1}$. One can check that we would later need a $T_{X_{T=1}^{0,\frac{1}{2}}} X_{T=1}^{-\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow X_{T=1}^{-\frac{1}{2},-\frac{1}{2}}$ estimate which unfortunately fails. In fact, one particular term in the conormal decomposition ends up in $X_{T=1}^{-1,0}$ and no better.*

We deal with the problem by another renormalization. For existence, we renormalized the low frequencies. Here, we lost the symmetry in the nonlinear term, and we would like to take advantage of the additional properties of u , the “good” solution. Rewrite the equation, using $v = u - \delta$,

$$(5.8) \quad \partial_t \delta + H \partial_x^2 \delta + (u - \delta) \partial_x \delta + \delta \partial_x u = 0.$$

which suggests a renormalization using $u - \delta = v$ as the exponential factor. However, one would like to leave the derivative acting on products of high frequencies, hence we rewrite once more (setting $V = u + v$), with paraproduct notations,

$$(5.9) \quad \partial_t \delta + H \partial_x^2 \delta + T_{\partial_x v} \delta + T_v \partial_x \delta + \partial_x \left(T_\delta u + \frac{1}{2} R(V, \delta) \right) = 0,$$

Localizing in frequencies in (5.8), we get

$$(5.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t \Delta_j^+ (\delta) - i \partial_x^2 \Delta_j^+ (\delta) + S_{j-1} v \partial_x \Delta_j^+ (\delta) \\ = - \Delta_j^+ \partial_x (\delta \prec_j u \sim_j) - \Delta_j^+ ((\partial_x v \prec_j) \delta \sim_j) - \frac{1}{2} \Delta_j^+ \partial_x \left(\sum_{j \lesssim k} V_{\sim k} \delta \sim_k \right) - [\Delta_j^+, v \prec_j] \partial_x \delta_j^+ \\ = f_{j,1}^+ + f_{j,2}^+ + f_{j,3}^+ + f_{j,4}^+. \end{aligned}$$

Then define ω^+ on $\xi > 0$ by $\omega_0^+ = P^+(S_0(\exp -\frac{i}{2} \int^x v) S_0 \delta)$ and

$$\omega^+ = \omega_0^+ + T_{\exp -\frac{i}{2} \int^x v} \delta^+, \text{ i.e. } \omega_j^+ = S_{j-1}(e^{-\frac{i}{2} \int^x v}) \Delta_j^+ \delta \text{ and } \omega^+ = \omega_0^+ + \sum_{j \geq 0} \omega_j^+.$$

One may then define ω by symmetry with $\omega^- = \bar{\omega}^+(-\xi)$ on the $\xi < 0$ part, so that the low frequencies of δ and ω are the same and ω is real valued.

From the renormalization estimates, we know that $\delta \in X_{T=1}^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1} \hookrightarrow X_{T=1}^{-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$, hence $\omega \in X_{T=1}^{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$ by using the gauge estimate in Proposition 3.1. We will estimate ω in $X_{T=1}^{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$ which, using Proposition 3.6, smallness of the data and Proposition 3.1 again, yields estimate (2.14).

The equation on ω_j is

$$(5.11) \quad \begin{aligned} i \partial_t \omega_j^+ + \partial_x^2 \omega_j^+ &= S_{j-1}(e^{-\frac{i}{2} \int^x v})(f_{j,1}^+ + f_{j,2}^+ + f_{j,3}^+ + f_{j,4}^+) \\ &+ \delta_j^+ S_{j-1}((v^2 + H \partial_x v) e^{-\frac{i}{2} \int^x v}) + \left(S_{j-1}(-\frac{i}{2} v e^{-\frac{i}{2} \int^x v}) - i S_{j-1}(v) S_{j-1}(e^{-\frac{i}{2} \int^x v}) \right) \partial_x \delta_j^+ \\ &= P_1 + P_2 + P_3 + P_4 + P_5 + P_6 \end{aligned}$$

This is essentially the same algebraic calculation as for the existence part. Note that the v^2 gives a cubic contribution, hence it will be easier to be dealt with (δ and ω can be estimated at the same regularity level, without conormal spaces). The last term and the $\partial_x v$ term are, up to commutations, $\omega_j \partial_x v \prec_j$. As before, the whole set of commutation terms are somewhat “better” in that they require no conormal spaces to deal with them; however, we are at a lower regularity level and lost symmetry, which lead to additional difficulties.

From our set of product estimates (see (A.13)), we know that all terms $T_{\partial_x v} \omega$ will be ok, meaning

$$\|T_{\partial_x v} \omega\|_{X_{T=1}^{-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}} \lesssim \|v\|_{X_{T=1}^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}} \|\omega\|_{X_{T=1}^{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}}.$$

In this section, for conciseness, we shall denote by $F^\pm = e^{\pm \frac{i}{2} \int^x v}$. We now proceed with estimating in $X_{T=1}^{-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$ all right-handside terms in 5.11.

- Term $P_1 = F_{\prec j} \partial_x (\delta_{\prec j} u_j^+)$. As in the existence section, we shall in a first step work in global Bourgain spaces as if u and v were also in the global spaces.

We need to deal with the relationship between δ_j and ω_j .

$$\omega_j^+ = F_{\prec j}^+ \delta_j^+ = F^+ \delta_j^+ + \sum_{k>j} \Delta_k F^+ \delta_j^+,$$

$$(5.12) \quad \delta_{j'}^+ = F^- \omega_{j'}^+ - \sum_{k>j'} F^- \Delta_k F^+ \delta_{j'}^+,$$

where we used $F_+^{-1} = F_-$, and summing over $j' \leq j-1$,

$$\delta_{\prec j}^+ = F^- \omega_{\prec j}^+ - \sum_{k>j', j'<j} F^- \Delta_k F^+ \delta_{j'}^+.$$

Now, the contribution of $\delta_{\prec j}^+$ to G , G^+ , is

$$\begin{aligned} (5.13) \quad P_1^+ &= \partial_x (F_{\prec j}^+ \delta_{\prec j} u_j^+) + \delta_{\prec j} u_j^+ S_{j-1} (-\frac{i}{2} v F^+) \\ &= \partial_x (F_+ \delta_{\prec j}^+ u_j^+) - \partial_x \left((F^+ - F_{\prec j}^+) \delta_{\prec j}^+ u_j^+ \right) + \delta_{\prec j}^+ u_j^+ S_{j-1} (-\frac{i}{2} v F^+) \\ &= \partial_x (\omega_{\prec j}^+ u_j^+) - \partial_x \sum_{k>j', j'>j'} F_k^+ \delta_{j'}^+ u_j^+ - \partial_x \left((F - F_{\prec j}) \delta_{\prec j}^+ u_j^+ \right) + \delta_{\prec j} u_j^+ S_{j-1} (-\frac{i}{2} v F^+) \\ &= P_{1,1}^+ + P_{1,2}^+ + P_{1,3}^+ + P_{1,4}^+. \end{aligned}$$

(remark that the F_- factor in (5.12) cancels with the F_+ factor in front of $\delta_{\prec j} u_j^+$). The first term is $\partial_x (T_{\omega^+} u^+)$ which is estimated according to (A.13),

$$\|\partial_x (T_{\omega^+} u^+)\|_{X^{-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}} \lesssim \|u\|_{X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}} \|\omega\|_{X^{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}}.$$

REMARK 5.2 *This term is the one which forces us to go down to $-\frac{1}{2}$ in regularity, apparently wasting $\frac{1}{4}$.*

Let us show how to estimate the remainder. The very last term ($P_{1,4}^+$) is cubic without derivatives and can be estimated easily:

$$\|\delta_{\prec j} u_j^+ S_{j-1} (i v F)\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \lesssim 2^{-\frac{3}{4}j} \|\delta_{\prec j}\|_{L_x^4(L_t^\infty)} 2^{+\frac{3}{4}j} \|u_j^+\|_{L_x^\infty(L_t^2)} \|v\|_{L_x^4(L_t^\infty)}.$$

But

$$2^{-\frac{3}{4}j} \|\delta_{\prec j}\|_{L_x^4(L_t^\infty)} \leq 2^{-\frac{3}{4}j} \|\omega_{\prec j}\|_{L_x^4(L_t^\infty)} \leq C \|\omega\|_{X^{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}}$$

and the other terms are controlled by our a priori assumptions (5.3) and (5.4). Consequently the sum over j will be in $X^{0,0,\infty} \hookrightarrow X^{-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$.

The last but one term, $P_{1,3}^+$, is again “cubic” because we can derive F and kill the ∂_x with it, getting a v instead, hence the same estimate. The worst one is $P_{1,2}^+$. We have (throwing away $1/4$ regularity on the F_k factor because of the j' sum)

$$2^{\frac{3}{4}j} u_j \in l_j^1(L_x^\infty L_t^2), \quad 2^{-\frac{3}{4}j'} \delta_{j'} \in L_x^4(L_t^\infty), \quad 2^{\frac{3}{4}k} \Delta_k F \in L_x^4(L_t^\infty),$$

where we used the usual trick $\Delta_k F = \partial^{-1} \Delta_k \partial_x F$ on the last term. Collecting everything yields

$$2^{-\frac{j}{4}} P_{1,2}^+ \in l_j^\infty(L_t^2 L_x^2),$$

which gives that $P_{1,2}^+ \in X^{-\frac{1}{4}, 0, \infty} \hookrightarrow X^{-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$.

We turn to the $\delta_{\prec j}^-$ contribution to P_1 which when we substitute doesn't kill the F factor in $F_{\prec j} \partial_x (\delta_{\prec j}^- u_j^+)$. Recall that u is the solution we constructed: its renormalized version $w^+ = T_{e^{-\frac{j}{2} \int^x u}} u^+$ belongs to $X^{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$. Furthermore,

$$F^+ = e^{-\frac{j}{2} \int^x v} = e^{\frac{j}{2} \int^x \delta} e^{-\frac{j}{2} \int^x u},$$

Thus, if one sees the $e^{-\frac{j}{2} \int^x u}$ acting on u , this term becomes after substitution and up to additional ‘‘cubic’’ terms as above (to split the low frequencies of the exponential in the product of low frequencies of exponentials)

$$\partial_x (\tilde{F}_{\prec j} \omega_{\prec j}^- w_j^+) \text{ with } \tilde{F} = e^{\frac{j}{2} \int^x \delta}.$$

We can now apply exactly the same strategy as above to estimate $\partial_x (\omega_{\prec j}^- w_j^+)$ and end up in $X^{-\frac{1}{4}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$ (again, notice the gain of a quarter of derivatives from substituting w to u , together with control of w in $X^{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$). Using Proposition 3.1 (which loses the quarter of derivatives we just gained) we estimate

$$\|T_{e^{\frac{j}{2} \int^x \delta}} (\partial_x (T \omega^- w^+))\|_{X^{-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}} \lesssim C(\delta) \|\omega\|_{X^{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}} \|w\|_{X^{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}}.$$

All other terms we discarded are cubic again and easily disposed of.

- Let us study P_2 . This term is nothing (up to more cubic terms) but $T_{\partial_x v} \omega^+$ which is estimated using (A.13) in $X^{-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$.
- Let us study the contribution of the third term $P_3 = F_{\prec j}^+ \partial_x (\Delta_j^+ \sum_{j \lesssim k} V_k \delta_k)$. Again, we would like to have ω_k rather than δ_k . We have

$$(5.14) \quad P_3 = \partial_x \Delta_j \sum_{j \lesssim k} (F_{\prec k}^+ V_k \delta_k + (F_{\prec j}^+ - F_{\prec k}^+) V_k \delta_k) + [F_j^+, \partial_x \Delta_j] \sum_{j \lesssim k} V_k \delta_k = P_{3,1} + P_{3,2} + P_{3,3}.$$

- term $P_{3,1}$: due to support conditions, in the product $V_k \delta_k$, the interactions $-, -$ cancel. As a consequence (since $V_k = 2u_k - \delta_k$), it is enough to estimate (distributing the $F_{\prec k}^+$ factor to δ_k^+)

$$\partial_x \Delta_j \sum_{j \lesssim k} (F_{+, \prec k} u_k \delta_k^+ = \partial_x \Delta_j R(u, \omega^+)$$

as well as (distributing the $F_{\prec k}^+$ factor to u_k^+)

$$\partial_x \Delta_j \sum_{j \lesssim k} (F_{+, \prec k} u_k^+ \delta_k^- = \partial_x \Delta_j R(w, \delta).$$

and

$$\partial_x \Delta_j \sum_{j \lesssim k} (F_{+, \prec k} \delta_k^+ \delta_k^- = \partial_x \Delta_j R(\delta, \omega^+).$$

But since u is the solution we constructed in the previous section, it is bounded in $X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$ and its renormalized version, w is bounded in $X^{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$. On the other hand, by assumption,

ω is bounded in $X^{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$ and consequently, according to Proposition 3.1, δ is bounded in $X^{-\frac{3}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$. Finally, δ is a priori bounded in $X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 2}$ and ω in $X^{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$ by assumption. Now the estimate on K_1 follow from product laws, namely (A.16).

– term $P_{3,2}$: this will be a variation on the cubic term, as

$$P_{3,2} = \partial_x \Delta_j \sum_{j \leq l \leq k} F_l^+ V_k \delta_k.$$

Recall that, using (2.12) and Proposition 3.8,

$$\|\delta_k\|_{L_x^\infty; L_t^2} \leq C \|\omega_k\|_{L_x^\infty; L_t^2} c_k \|\omega\|_{X^{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}}, \quad (c_k)_k \in l^1$$

and, according to our *a priori* assumptions on v and u (5.4),

$$\|V_k\|_{L_x^4(L_t^2)} \leq c_k \in l^1$$

Hence,

$$\|\delta_k V_k\|_{L_x^4(L_t^2)} \leq \eta_k \in l_k^1.$$

This together with

$$F_l \approx 2^{-l}(vF)_l, \Rightarrow \|F_l\|_{L_x^4(L_t^\infty)} \sim 2^{-l} \|v\|_{L_x^4(L_t^\infty)} \sim 2^{-l}$$

finally we get an estimate in

$$X^{0,0,\infty} \hookrightarrow X^{-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}.$$

– term $P_{3,3} = [F_j^+, \partial_x \Delta_j] \sum_{j \lesssim k} V_k \delta_k$ The following Lemma (which appeared in a slightly different form in [3] shows that we can estimate this term as if we had $\partial_x F_j^+$ in place of the commutator (and consequently as we estimated $P_{3,2}$)

LEMMA 5.3 *Let $g(x, t)$ be such that $\|\partial_x g\|_{L_x^{p_1}(L_t^{q_\infty})} < +\infty$, and $f(x, t) \in L_x^{p_\infty}(L_t^{q_2})$, with $\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_\infty} = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{q_\infty} + \frac{1}{q_2} = \frac{1}{2}$, then $h(x, t) = [\Delta_j, g]f$ is bounded in $L_x^1(L_t^2)$ by*

$$C 2^{-j} \|\partial_x g\|_{L_x^{p_1}(L_t^{q_\infty})} \|f(x, t)\|_{L_x^{p_\infty}(L_t^{q_2})}$$

Proof: We first take $p_1 = 2$, $p_\infty = \infty$: set $h(x) = [\Delta_j, g]f$, recall Δ_j is a convolution by $2^j \phi(2^j \cdot)$, and denote $\psi(z) = z|\phi|(z)$:

$$\begin{aligned} h(x) &= \int_y 2^j \phi(2^j(x-y))(g(y) - g(x))f(y)dy \\ &= \int_{y, \theta \in [0,1]} 2^j \phi(2^j(x-y))(x-y)g'(x+\theta(y-x))f(y)d\theta dy \\ |h(x)| &\leq 2^{-j} \int_{y, \theta \in [0,1]} 2^j \psi(2^j(x-y))|g'(x+\theta(y-x))||f(y)|d\theta dy \end{aligned}$$

and then take successively time norms and space norms,

$$\begin{aligned} \|h(x, t)\|_{L_t^2} &\leq 2^{-j} \int_{y, \theta \in [0,1]} 2^j \psi(2^j(x-y))\|g'(x+\theta(y-x, t))\|_{L_t^{q_\infty}} \|f(y, t)\|_{L_t^{q_2}} d\theta dy \\ \|h(x)\|_{L_{t,x}^2}^2 &\leq 2^{-j} \|f\|_{L_x^\infty(L_t^{q_2})} \int_{\theta \in [0,1]} \left\| \int_y 2^j \psi(2^j(x-y))\|g'(x+\theta(y-x))\|_{L_t^{q_\infty}} dy \right\|_{L_x^2}^2 d\theta \\ &\leq 2^{-j} \int_{\theta \in [0,1]} \left\| \int_z \frac{2^j}{\theta} \psi\left(\frac{2^j}{\theta}(x-z)\right)\|g'(z)\|_{L_t^{q_\infty}} dz \right\|_{L_x^2}^2 d\theta \\ &\leq 2^{-j} \int_{\theta \in [0,1]} \|g'(x+\theta z)\|_{L_x^2; L_t^{q_\infty}}^2 d\theta \end{aligned}$$

The case $p_1 = \infty$, $p_\infty = 2$ is identical, exchanging f and g' (in fact, this would be the usual commutator estimate !). The general case then follows by bilinear complex interpolation. $\square$

- Let us now deal with the commutator which appears in f_j , P_4 , namely

$$P_4 = F_{\prec j}[\Delta_j, v_{\prec j}]\partial_x \sum_{k \sim j} \delta_k^+.$$

First, we may replace the $F_{\prec j}$ factor by F : the difference $F - F_{\prec j}$ will lead to a cubic term where we do not need to take advantage of the commutator structure. Then, we commute F with everything else to obtain $F\delta_k^+$ which we know is ω_k^+ + "cubic terms". The additional commutators, namely $[F, \Delta_j]$ or $[F, \partial_x]$ all gain regularity and yield cubic terms. Thus, we are finally left with

$$\tilde{C}_j = [\Delta_j, v_{\prec j}]\partial_x \sum_{k \sim j} \omega_k,$$

which can be estimated in conormal spaces, exactly as we did for existence, through Lemma 4.1.

- Let us study $P_5 = \delta_j S_{j-1}(\partial_x v F)$. Up to commutator terms which are cubic again, we have

$$P_5 = \delta_j^+ F_{\prec j} \partial_x v_{\prec j} + \delta_j^+ S_{j-1} \left(\sum_{k > j} \partial_x v_k F_k \right) + \delta_j^+ S_{j-1} (F_{+, \prec j} v_j + v_{\prec j} F_{+, j}),$$

because other terms vanish by support considerations. The first of these terms is $T_{\partial_x v} \omega$ which is ok in conormal spaces. The second term is ok because

$$F_k \approx 2^{-k} \partial_x (F_k) = 2^{-k} \Delta_k (v F),$$

which leads to a "cubic" term and the last one is basically the same.

- Term $P_6 = (S_{j-1}(v F) - S_{j-1} v S_{j-1} F) \partial_x \delta_j$: again, up to commutators, we cancel the second term to get

$$P_6 \approx S_{j-1} \left(\sum_{k > j} v_k F_k \right) \partial_x \delta_j^+,$$

which is essentially the same "cubic" term as before, and therefore ends up in $X^{0,0,\infty}$.

Finally, we can collect all terms: recall

$$\partial_t \omega + H \partial_x^2 \omega = K,$$

and we just proved

$$\|K\|_{X^{-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}} \lesssim C(u, v) \|\omega\|_{X^{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}},$$

which immediately yields using the equation

$$\|\omega\|_{X^{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}} \lesssim \|\omega_0\|_{B_2^{-\frac{1}{2}, 1}},$$

As in the previous section we can now pass from the global Bourgain space to the correct local Bourgain space procedure and obtain

$$\|\omega\|_{X_{T=1}^{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}} \lesssim \|\omega_0\|_{B_2^{-\frac{1}{2}, 1}},$$

which provides uniqueness if $\omega_0 = 0$ and the desired continuity by inverting the gauge transform and interpolation. $\square$

6 Uniqueness for weak finite energy solutions

In this section we prove uniqueness in the natural finite energy space, $L_t^\infty(H^{1/2})$.

THEOREM 8 *Assume that v is an $L_t^\infty(H^{1/2})$ solution to the Benjamin-Ono equation*

$$\partial_t v + H\partial_x^2 v = -\frac{\partial_x}{2}(v^2).$$

Then $v \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_t; \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}_x))$ and consequently $v|_{t=0}$ makes sense in $\mathcal{D}'$. Then we have

$$\|v|_{t=0}\|_{H^{1/2}} \lesssim \|v\|_{L^\infty(H^{1/2})}$$

and if u is another such solution, there exist $C, T > 0$ depending both only of $\|v\|_{L^\infty(H^{1/2})}$, $\|u\|_{L^\infty(H^{1/2})}$ such that

$$(6.1) \quad \|u - v\|_{X_T^{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}} \leq C \|u|_{t=0} - v|_{t=0}\|_{B_2^{-\frac{1}{2}, 1}} \leq C \|u|_{t=0} - v|_{t=0}\|_{H^{1/2}}$$

The first part of the Theorem is clear as

$$\partial_t v = H\partial_x^2 v + \frac{\partial_x}{2}(v^2) \in L_t^\infty; \mathcal{S}'.$$

To prove control of $v|_{t=0}$ in $H^{1/2}$, we simply take a sequence $t_n > 0 \rightarrow 0$ such that $\|v(t_n)\|_{H^{1/2}} \leq \|v\|_{L^\infty; H^{1/2}}$ and use $v(t_n) \rightarrow v|_{t=0}$ in $\mathcal{D}'$. The main point is of course to prove (6.1). We will prove this estimate assuming first that u is the strong solution of (1.1) we constructed in Section 4. Then applying this estimate to $v|_{t=0} = u_0$, it implies uniqueness and consequently the fact that u is a strong solution is no longer an assumption.

Applying $e^{tH\partial_x^2}$ to v , remark that v is a solution of the Duhamel equation

$$v(t, \cdot) = e^{-tH\partial_x^2} v|_{t=0} - \int_0^t (e^{-(t-s)H\partial_x^2} (\frac{\partial_x}{2}(v^2))).$$

We proceed to prove a few a priori bounds on v (and u). By rescaling, we consider again the small datum case, with $T \sim 1$.

LEMMA 6.1 *Assume that $v \in L_T^\infty(H^{1/2})$, then for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exist $C > 0$ such that for any j*

$$\|\Delta_j(v)\|_{L_T^4(L^\infty)} \leq C(1+T)^{1/4} 2^{j(-\frac{1}{4}+\epsilon)} \|v\|_{L^\infty(-1, T+1; H^{1/2})}^{\frac{3}{2}} (1 + \|v\|_{L^\infty(-1, T+1; H^{1/2})}^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

As a by product, weak solutions are $L_{t,loc}^4(L^\infty)$.

Proof: Consider $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}_t)$. We have

$$\|\chi(2^j t) \Delta_j(v)\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \leq C 2^{-j}$$

and $\chi(2^j t) \Delta_j(v)$ satisfies

$$(6.2) \quad (\partial_t + H\partial_x^2) \chi(2^j t) \Delta_j(v) = 2^j \chi'(2^j t) \Delta_j(v) + \frac{1}{2} \chi(2^j t) \partial_x \Delta_j \left(\sum_{k \leq j} v_k v_j + \sum_{k > j} v_k^2 \right)$$

and (using Sobolev injection on one v_k factor and the fact that the integrals in time are taken on intervals of length of size 2^{-j}) we estimate the right hand side in $L_{t,x}^2$ by

$$\|v\|_{L_t^\infty(H^{1/2})} + (2^j \sum_{k \leq j} 2^{-j} + 2^j \sum_{k \geq j} 2^{-k}) \|v\|_{L_t^\infty(H^s)}^2 \lesssim (1+j) \|v\|_{L_t^\infty(H^{1/2})}$$

As a consequence we obtain the following bounds

$$\|\chi(2^j t) \Delta_j(v)\|_{X^{0,0,2}} \lesssim 2^{-j} \|v\|_{L_t^\infty; H^{1/2}}, \quad \|\chi(2^j t) \Delta_j(v)\|_{X^{0,1,2}} \lesssim (1+j) \|v\|_{L_t^\infty(H^{1/2})}.$$

Interpolating between these two bounds (j is fixed), we obtain (remark that even though it is not essential, we regain the l^1 summability with respect to the k index by using Lemma 3.4)

$$\|\chi(2^j t) \Delta_j(v)\|_{X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}} \lesssim \sqrt{j} 2^{-\frac{j}{2}} \|v\|_{L_t^\infty(H^{1/2})}.$$

But, according to (2.9), we have

$$\|\chi(2^j t) \Delta_j(v)\|_{L_t^4(L^\infty)} \lesssim \|\chi(2^j t) \Delta_j(v)\|_{X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}},$$

and applying this inequality between times $0, 2^{-j}, 2^{-j}, 2 \times 2^{-j}, \dots, 2^j \times 2^{-j} = 1$, we obtain

$$\|\Delta_j(v)\|_{L_t^4(L^\infty)} \lesssim \sqrt{j} 2^{-\frac{j}{4}} \|v\|_{L_t^\infty(H^{1/2})} (1 + \|v\|_{L_t^\infty(H^{1/2})}^{\frac{1}{2}}),$$

which is definitely summable over j : in fact, we obtained that $v \in \mathcal{L}_t^4(B_\infty^{\frac{1}{4}-\epsilon, 1}) \hookrightarrow L_t^4 L_x^\infty$. $\square$

COROLLARY 6.2 *For any $0 \leq \theta < 1$, we have*

$$\|v\|_{X^{\frac{1}{2}-\theta, \theta, 2}} \lesssim \|v\|_{L_t^\infty(H^{1/2})} (1 + \|v\|_{L_t^\infty(H^{1/2})}^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

We consider the equation satisfied by $\chi(t)v$

$$(\partial_t + H \partial_x^2) \chi \Delta_j(v) = \chi'(t) \Delta_j(v) + \frac{1}{2} \chi(t) \partial_x \Delta_j \left(\sum_{k \leq j} v_k v_j + \sum_{k > j} v_k^2 \right)$$

and we estimate the right hand side in $L_{t,x}^2$ (using the $L^4(L^\infty)$ estimate we just proved) by

$$2^{-\frac{j}{2}} + 2^j \sum_{k \leq j} \sqrt{k} 2^{k(-\frac{1}{4})} 2^{-\frac{j}{2}} + 2^j \sum_{k \geq j} \sqrt{k} 2^{-\frac{3k}{4}}$$

As a consequence we obtain

$$\|\chi(t) \Delta_j(v)\|_{X^{0,0,2}} \leq C 2^{-\frac{j}{2}} C \|v\|_{L_t^\infty(H^{1/2})}, \quad \|\chi(t) \Delta_j(v)\|_{X^{0,1,2}} \leq C 2^{\frac{j}{2}} \|v\|_{L_t^\infty(H^{1/2})}^2$$

which reads

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\Delta_{j,k}^\pm(\chi(t)v)\|_{L_{t,x}^2} &\leq C 2^{-\frac{j}{2}} C \|v\|_{L_t^\infty(H^{1/2})} c_k; & \|c_k\|_{l_k^2} &\leq 1 \\ \|\Delta_{j,k}^\pm(\chi(t)v)\|_{L_{t,x}^2} &\leq C 2^{\frac{j}{2}-k} \|v\|_{L_t^\infty(H^{1/2})}^2 c_k; & \|c_k\|_{l_k^2} &\leq 1 \end{aligned}$$

and the use of Lemma 3.4 (with fixed k) to regain the l^2 summability in j) gives the Corollary. $\square$

We now return to the proof of (6.1). From the lemma, we know that $\delta \in X_{T=1}^{-\epsilon, \frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 2} \hookrightarrow X_{T=1}^{-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$, hence $\omega \in X_{T=1}^{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$ as before. We will estimate again ω in $X_{T=1}^{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$.

Before proceeding, recall that v satisfy

$$(6.4) \quad \|v\|_{X^{-\epsilon, \frac{1}{2}, 1}} \leq C \Rightarrow \|\Delta_j(v)\|_{L_t^4(L_x^\infty)} \leq C2^{\epsilon j}$$

$$(6.5) \quad \|v\|_{L^\infty(H^{1/2})} \leq C \Rightarrow \|\Delta_j(v)\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)} \leq C2^{-\frac{j}{2}}$$

according to Corollary 6.2. Furthermore, since u is the solution we just constructed, it satisfies (5.2), (5.3) and (5.4) and its renormalized version satisfy the additional estimate (5.6) (one could actually prove it to be even better, namely $X^{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 2}$).

Recall all terms $T_{\partial_x v} \omega$ are under control according to (A.15),

$$\|T_{\partial_x v} \omega\|_{X_{T=1}^{-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}} \lesssim \|v\|_{X_{T=1}^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 2}} \|\omega\|_{X_{T=1}^{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 2}}.$$

We now proceed with estimating in $X_{T=1}^{-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$ all right-handside terms in (5.11). We follow closely the estimates in the previous section and will only point out the differences. As before we forget in the first step the local Bourgain spaces and work with global ones.

- Term $P_1 = F_{\prec j} \partial_x (\delta_{\prec j} u_j^+)$.

- Term $P_{1,1}^+ = \partial_x (T_{\omega^+} u^+)$ which is estimated according to (A.13): the solution u that we constructed in Section 4 is in $X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$ (it is actually even better since the initial data is in $H^{1/2}$, it is in $X^{\frac{1}{4}-0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$)
- Term $P_{1,4}^+$. We remark that interpolating between (6.4) and (6.5), for any $\theta > 0$, v is bounded in

$$L_t^{\frac{4}{(1-\theta)}} (L_\theta^{\frac{2}{\theta}}).$$

We choose θ arbitrary close to 0 and write

$$\|\delta_{\prec j} u_j^+ S_{j-1}(ivF)\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \lesssim 2^{-\frac{1}{2}j} \|\delta_{\prec j}\|_{L_t^{\frac{4}{1-\theta}} (L_\theta^{\frac{2}{\theta}})} 2^{\frac{1}{2}j} \|u_j^+\|_{L_t^{\frac{2}{\theta}} (L_t^{\frac{2}{(1-2\theta)}})} \|v\|_{L_t^{\frac{4}{(1-\theta)}} (L_\theta^{\frac{2}{\theta}})}.$$

and using (5.3) and (5.4) we can estimate

$$\|u_j^+\|_{L_x^{\frac{2}{\theta}} (L_t^{\frac{2}{(1-2\theta)}})} \leq 2^{(\epsilon - \frac{1}{2})j}$$

As a consequence, $P_{1,4}^+$ is in $X^{-\epsilon, 0, \infty} \hookrightarrow X^{-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$.

- Term $P_{1,3}^+$. It is again “cubic” because we can derive F and kill the ∂_x with it, getting a v instead, hence the same estimate.
- Term $P_{1,2}^+$. We write $F_k \sim 2^{-k} (vF)_k$. We remark that by support condition, we can restrict the sum to the set $k \leq j$. We have to estimate

$$2^j \sum_{j' \leq k \leq j} 2^{-k} \|\delta_{j'}\|_{L_t^{\frac{4}{1-\theta}} (L_\theta^{\frac{2}{\theta}})} \|(vF)_k\|_{L_t^{\frac{4}{1-\theta}} (L_\theta^{\frac{2}{\theta}})} \|u_j\|_{L_t^{\frac{2}{\theta}} (L_t^{\frac{2}{(1-2\theta)}})} \leq 2^j \sum_{j' \leq k \leq j} 2^{\frac{1}{2}j' + (\epsilon - \frac{1}{2})j} \leq 2^{\epsilon j}$$

which gives an estimate in $X^{-\epsilon, 0, \infty}$

- The main terms in the $\delta_{\prec j}^-$ contribution to P_1 are estimated as in the previous section whereas the cubic remainders are estimated as above.

- Let us study P_2 . This term is nothing (up to more cubic terms) but $T_{\partial_x v} \omega^+$ which is estimated using (A.15) in $X^{-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$.
- Let us study the contribution of the third term $P_3 = F_{\prec j}^+ \partial_x (\Delta_j^+ \sum_{j \lesssim k} V_k \delta_k)$. Again, we would like to have ω_k rather than δ_k . We have

$$(6.6) \quad P_3 = \partial_x \Delta_j \sum_{j \lesssim k} (F_{\prec k}^+ V_k \delta_k + (F_{\prec j}^+ - F_{\prec k}^+) V_k \delta_k) + [F_j^+, \partial_x \Delta_j] \sum_{j \lesssim k} V_k \delta_k = P_{3,1} + P_{3,2} + P_{3,3}.$$

- Term $P_{3,1}$ is estimated as in the previous section
- term $P_{3,2}$: this will again be a variation on the cubic term, as

$$P_{3,2} = \partial_x \Delta_j \sum_{j \leq l \leq k} F_l^+ V_l \delta_k.$$

Recall that, using (2.9),

$$\|\delta_k\|_{L_t^4(L_x^\infty)} \lesssim \|\omega_k\|_{L_t^4(L_x^\infty)} \leq c_k 2^{\frac{k}{2}} \|\omega\|_{X^{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}}, \quad (c_k)_k \in l^1.$$

On the other hand, using (6.5),

$$\|V_k\|_{L_t^\infty(L^2)} \leq C 2^{-\frac{k}{2}}$$

and according to Lemma 6.1

$$\|v\|_{L_t^4(L^\infty)} \lesssim 1$$

As a consequence

$$(6.7) \quad \|P_{3,2}\|_{L_{t,x}^2} \lesssim 2^j \sum_{j \leq l \leq k} 2^{-l} c_k \lesssim 1.$$

This yields an estimate in

$$X^{0,0,\infty} \hookrightarrow X^{-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}.$$

- Term $P_{3,3}$: using the following Lemma (a simplified version of Lemma 5.3), we can estimate this term, exactly as we estimated $P_{3,2}$.

LEMMA 6.3 *Let $g(x)$ be such that $\|\partial_x g\|_{L_x^\infty} < +\infty$, then we have*

$$\|[\Delta_j, g]f\|_{L_x^2} \leq C 2^{-j} \|\partial_x g\|_{L_x^\infty} \|f(x, t)\|_{L_x^2}$$

- Let us now deal with the commutator which appears in f_j , P_4 , namely

$$P_4 = F_{\prec j} [\Delta_j, v_{\prec j}] \partial_x \sum_{k \sim j} \delta_k^+.$$

First, we may replace the $F_{\prec j}$ factor by F : the difference $F - F_{\prec j}$ will lead to a cubic term where we do not need to take advantage of the commutator structure. Then, we commute F with everything else to obtain $F \delta_k$ which we know is ω_k^+ + "cubic terms". The additional commutators, namely $[F, \Delta_j]$ or $[F, \partial_x]$ all gain regularity and yield cubic terms. Thus, we are finally left with

$$\tilde{C}_j = [\Delta_j, v_{\prec j}] \partial_x \sum_{k \sim j} \omega_k,$$

which can be estimated in conormal spaces, exactly as we did for existence through Lemma 4.1.

- Let us study $P_5 = \delta_j S_{j-1}(\partial_x v F)$. Up to commutator terms which are cubic again, we have

$$P_5 = \delta_j^+ F_{\prec j} \partial_x v_{\prec j} + \delta_j^+ S_{j-1} \left(\sum_{k>j} \partial_x v_k F_k \right) + \delta_j^+ S_{j-1} (F_{+, \prec j} v_j + v_{\prec j} F_{+, j}),$$

because other terms vanish by support considerations. The first of these terms is $T_{\partial_x v} \omega$ which is ok in conormal spaces (according to (A.15)). The second term is ok because

$$F_k \approx 2^{-k} \partial_x (F_k) = 2^{-k} \Delta_k (v F),$$

which leads to a “cubic” term and the last one is basically the same.

- Term $P_6 = (S_{j-1}(v F) - S_{j-1} v S_{j-1} F) \partial_x \delta_j$: again, up to commutators, we cancel the second term to get

$$P_6 \approx S_{j-1} \left(\sum_{k>j} v_k F_k \right) \partial_x \delta_j^+,$$

which is essentially the same “cubic” term as before, and therefore ends up in $X^{0,0,\infty}$.

Finally, we can collect all terms: recall

$$\partial_t \omega + H \partial_x^2 \omega = K,$$

and we just proved

$$\|K\|_{X^{-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}} \lesssim C(u, v) \|\omega\|_{X^{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}},$$

with a constant C small if u and v are small in $L^\infty; H^{1/2}$ (remark that the norms of the strong solution u involved are controlled by $\|u + 0\|_{H^{1/2}}$ and hence by $\|u\|_{L^\infty; H^{1/2}}$). This immediately yields using the equation

$$\|\omega\|_{X^{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}} \lesssim \|\omega_0\|_{B_2^{-\frac{1}{2}, 1}},$$

We now use the substitution procedure which gives

$$\|\omega\|_{X_{T=1}^{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}} \lesssim \|\omega_0\|_{B_2^{-\frac{1}{2}, 1}},$$

7 Existence and uniqueness in the $s < \frac{1}{4}$ range

We now provide an outline of the proof of Theorem 6. A detailed proof involves a complete rewriting of the previous sections, which, given the result from [8], is not worth the effort at this stage where the uniqueness part is not optimal.

We start with existence in the $0 < s < \frac{1}{4}$ range. We seek the renormalized function $w \in X^{\varepsilon, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$. Assume for now that the mapping from Proposition 3.1 holds true, despite the fact that we now expect $u \in X^{-\frac{1}{4}+\varepsilon, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$. Moreover, we also assume $u \in X^{-\frac{1}{8}+\varepsilon, \frac{1}{4}, 1}$, by using Proposition 3.1 when $b = \frac{1}{4}$ rather than $\frac{1}{2}$ together with the a priori knowledge on w . Ignore as well the cubic terms in the equation for w , we decompose

$$w = w_L + w_1 + w_2 + w_3,$$

where w_L is the linear part, hence $w_L \in X^{\varepsilon, \infty, 1}$. The three other terms come from inverting the linear operator on the bilinear term (which involves interactions between u and w).

- We set w_1 to be the term associated to source terms $R_1(u, w) \in X^{\varepsilon+(\varepsilon-\frac{1}{4})+\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$, which gains $\frac{1}{4}$ spatial regularity. These terms come from all bilinear interactions where, in the notation of the Appendix, the output is $X^{s+s'+\frac{3}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$.

- Next, w_2 comes from (reminder) source terms $R_2(u, w) \in X^{\varepsilon+(\varepsilon-\frac{1}{4}), -\frac{1}{4}, 1} \cap X^{\varepsilon+(\varepsilon-\frac{1}{8}), -\frac{1}{2}, 1} \cap X^{\varepsilon+\varepsilon, -\frac{3}{4}, 1}$; moreover, it is worth noting that R_2 is localized in the $k'' < 2j''$ region, with notations from the Appendix (and only involves the $j'' \sim j' \sim j < k/2$ zone on the u, w factors), hence $w_2 \in X^{2\varepsilon-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}, 1} \cap X^{2\varepsilon-\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{2}, 1} \cap X^{2\varepsilon, \frac{1}{4}, 1}$.
- Finally, w_3 arises from the “worst” same spatial frequency interactions $R_3(u, w)$, which are (picking $u \in X^{\varepsilon-\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{4}, 1}$) in $X^{2\varepsilon-\frac{1}{8}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$ and localized at $k'' \sim 2j''$, hence $w_3 \in X^{2\varepsilon-\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{2}, 1} \cap X^{\varepsilon+(\varepsilon-\frac{1}{8})+\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4}, 1}$, and moreover, its Fourier localization is in the region $j'' \sim 2k''$.

Obviously, $w_L \in X^{\varepsilon+(\varepsilon-\frac{1}{4}), \frac{3}{4}, 1}$, and we may relabel w_2 to be $w_L + w_2$. Similarly, all cubic terms will be controlled in $X^{2\varepsilon, 0, 2}$ (notice in the $s = \frac{1}{4}$ case, we had $\frac{1}{2}$ spatial regularity to spare, which now becomes only an ε), and inverting the linear operator yields yet another term which we can safely incorporate into w_2 . Strictly speaking, both w_L and cubic terms have a part in the $2j'' < k''$, but there one may trade conormal regularity for spatial regularity and add them to w_1 .

Given the regularity loss, we cannot close an a priori estimate at this level. However, one may go back to worst the bilinear interactions, which occur in $\partial_x R(u, w)$, and perform further substitution of u by w ; the price to pay is another bunch of harmless cubic terms, and new bilinear interactions $K\partial_x R(w, w)$, where K stands for a renormalization operator like in Proposition 3.1, arising from the gauge. In the case $s = \frac{1}{4}$, there was nothing to gain from such a substitution, as $\partial_x R(w, w) \in X^{\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$, and the $\frac{1}{4}$ gain would be lost when applying K . Let us check what estimates we may get, recalling that $R = R_1 + R_2 + R_3$:

- on $\partial_x R(u, w_1)$, we do not perform substitution, but the usual product rules give

$$X^{2\varepsilon+\frac{1}{4}+\varepsilon-\frac{1}{4}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$$

which will close;

- on $\partial_x R(u, w_2)$, we do not perform substitution on R_1 and R_2 , but the usual product rules give $X^{\varepsilon-\frac{1}{4}+2\varepsilon-\frac{1}{4}+\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$ which will close (we used $b = \frac{3}{4}$ on w_2); on the remaining (“worst”) term R_3 , we need to substitute.
 1. $\partial_x R_3(w_1, w_2)$: this worst part is $X^{\varepsilon+\frac{1}{4}+\varepsilon, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$, where we took advantage of $b = \frac{1}{4}$ on w_2 , and this term will close as well, losing $1/4$ with K (no spare spatial regularity);
 2. $\partial_x R_2(w_2, w_2)$: assume one of the two factors is such that $j'' \sim j < k$ (or $j'' \sim j' < k'$), then it will be $X^{2\varepsilon, \frac{1}{2}}$ by trading conormal for spatial, and this term will be $X^{4\varepsilon, -\frac{1}{2}}$. The gauge does not yield any loss when applied to such a localized ($2j'' \sim k''$) term : in fact, in the term which yields the $1/2$ loss when K acts on $X^{0, 1}$, one may use the $1/2$ remaining conormal regularity (which we threw away) to compensate for the spatial loss. Hence we close as well. Now, if both factors are such that $k < j''$ and $k' < j''$, then this term actually vanishes by support considerations (it requires $k > 2j''$!).
 3. $\partial_x R_3(w_3, w_2)$: using $b' = \frac{1}{4}$ on w_3 , we get $X^{2\varepsilon-\frac{1}{8}+\frac{1}{2}+2\varepsilon-\frac{1}{8}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$ which is tight.

Finally, we substitute on the whole $\partial_x R(u, w_3)$:

- consider $\partial_x R(w_1, w_3)$:
 1. the easiest part $R_1(w_1, w_3)$ is $X^{2\varepsilon+\frac{1}{4}+2\varepsilon-\frac{1}{8}+\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$ which will close;
 2. the next one $R_2(w_1, w_3)$ will be $X^{2\varepsilon+\frac{1}{4}+2\varepsilon-\frac{1}{8}, -\frac{1}{4}, 1}$, and K will only lose $\frac{1}{8}$ which is tight.

3. the third part $R_3(w_1, w_3)$ is $X^{\varepsilon + \frac{1}{4} + 2\varepsilon - \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$, where we took advantage of $b = \frac{1}{4}$ on w_3 , and this term will close;
- consider $\partial_x R(w_2, w_3)$:
 1. the easiest part $R_1(w_2, w_3)$ is $X^{2\varepsilon - \frac{1}{8} + 2\varepsilon - \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$ which will close;
 2. the second part $R_2(w_2, w_3)$ vanishes by support considerations (as w_3 is localized at $k \sim 2j \sim 2j''$ is does not contribute: we are in a situation where $k'' < 2j''$ but actually one may take $k'' < 2j'' - 100$ in the bilinear estimate which yields w_2).
 3. the third part $R_3(w_1, w_3)$ is $X^{2\varepsilon - \frac{1}{8} + 2\varepsilon + \frac{3}{8}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$, where we took advantage of $b = \frac{1}{4}$ on w_3 , and this term will close;
 - consider $\partial_x R(w_3, w_3)$:
 1. the easiest part $R_1(w_3, w_3)$ is $X^{2\varepsilon - \frac{1}{8} + 2\varepsilon - \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$ which will close;
 2. the next one, $R_2(w_3, w_3)$, vanishes for the same reasons as in the previous case.
 3. the third part $R_3(w_3, w_3)$ is $X^{2\varepsilon - \frac{1}{8} + 2\varepsilon + \frac{3}{8}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$, where we took advantage of $b = \frac{1}{4}$ on w_3 , and this term will close;

It remains to to deal with the gauge: the operator $K \equiv T_{\exp(f^x u)}$ acting on ϕ yields a term $T_u \partial_x \phi$, in which we substitute w to u (actually, similar terms arise as well in the other factors, unlike before). The worse terms occur in the form of

$$\sum_{l < j-2} \Delta_l \left(\sum_{l \lesssim k} \Delta_k F^{-1} \Delta_k F \Delta_l u \right) \partial_x \Delta_j \phi,$$

where F is the imaginary factor. But given $FF^{-1} = 1 = T_F F^{-1} + T_{F^{-1}} F + R(F, F)$, we may substitute the remainder term $R(F, F)$ to reduce to estimating

$$\|\Delta_l F \Delta_l u \partial_x \Delta_j \phi\|_2 \lesssim 2^{-l} 2^{\frac{l}{4}} 2^{\frac{l}{4}} 2^{\frac{j}{2}},$$

using the smoothing estimate on u and the maximal function estimate on $\partial_x F$ and u . This allows to close the gauge as well.

REMARK 7.1 *It should be clear for the previous outline that whenever $s > \frac{1}{8}$, one does **not** need to iterate the bilinear interactions twice, but that an appropriate use of the gauge estimate in the $b = \frac{1}{4}$ case is enough to close, combined with the fact that only an estimate on $u \in X^{\sigma, \frac{1}{4}, 1}$ is required for all “worst” terms R_1, R_2, R_3 . Note that all Duhamel terms in w end up in $X^{2\varepsilon, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$. When ε is actually $\frac{1}{8}$, this translates into a regularity gain.*

We now turn to uniqueness: recall the equation after renormalization by the “worst” solution v (denoting by K_v the gauge operator) is

$$\partial_t \omega + H \partial_x^2 \omega + T_{\partial_x v} \omega + K_v \partial_x (T_\delta u + R(2u, \delta) - R(\delta, \delta)) = 0.$$

Note that as long as $s \geq 0$, assuming the solution to be in $X^{s - \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$, the gauge transform maps now $X^{\sigma, \pm \frac{1}{2}, 1}$ to $X^{\sigma - \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{2}(s - \frac{1}{4}), \pm \frac{1}{2}, 1}$ and we may consider $\omega \in X^{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$ as in the range $s > \frac{1}{4}$.

The worst term appears to be $K_v \partial_x T_\delta u$, on which a complete substitution produces a term $K_\delta \partial_x T_\omega w$, where w is the renormalized solution $K_u u$. Unlike on the other paraproduct, the regularity of the low frequencies is $s' = -\frac{1}{2}$ for which we barely recover the front derivative : however,

the output before the gauge is then $X^{s+s', -\frac{1}{4}, 1}$ and the gauge loss is slightly better; hence, from $w \in X^{s, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$, we obtain a condition $s - \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{4}(s - \frac{1}{4}) > 0$, which is exactly $s > 3/20$. Next, $R(2u, \delta)$ requires exactly the same treatment (full substitution) with the same result. The two remaining terms (up to cubic terms) $T_{\partial_x v} \omega$ and $\partial_x R(\delta, \omega)$ are easier, and the same goes for all cubic terms (though some become actually quartic through frequency decomposition of the derivative of the exponential from the gauge).

A Bilinear estimates

A.1 Conormal dyadic blocs products

Recall that we defined a localization w.r.t. ξ and $\tau - \xi|\xi|$, see (2.4). Now set

$$(A.1) \quad \Delta_{jk}^\pm u(x, t) = \mathcal{F}_{\tau, \xi}^{-1}(\psi_{jk}^\pm(\tau, \xi) \mathcal{F}_{t, x}(u)),$$

where we recall that

$$\psi_{jk}^\pm(\tau, \xi) = \chi_{\log |\xi| \sim j} \chi_{\log |\tau \mp \xi^2| \sim k},$$

where $\sim$ means equivalent (except for $j = -1$ or $k = -1$ for which it means $\lesssim$). We define two spaces which are the restriction to positive and negative spectrum of $X^{s, b, q}$.

DEFINITION A.1 *Let $u(x, t) \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$, $s, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $1 \leq q \leq +\infty$. We say that $u \in X_\pm^{s, b, q}$ if and only if $\text{supp } \mathcal{F}_{t, x} u \subset \{\pm \xi \geq 0\}$ and for all $j \geq -1$,*

$$(A.2) \quad \|\Delta_{jk}^\pm u\|_{L_{t, x}^2} \lesssim 2^{-js - kb} \varepsilon_{jk}, \quad (\varepsilon_{jk})_{jk} \in l^q.$$

REMARK A.2 *If it were not for the $\pm \xi \geq 0$ restriction, we would have defined the usual Schrödinger Bourgain spaces. As such, all the estimates we need in $X^{s, b, q}$ can be deduced from estimates on products of functions in $X_{\pm, T}^{s, b, q}$, by reducing to dyadic pieces and sorting out all possible sign combinations. Therefore, all subsequent estimates could be retrieved, one way or another, from the existing literature, see [10, 17, 5]. We elected to give a self-contained proof in order to streamline the reading and highlight as best as possible what the optimal estimate is, depending on the frequencies constraints we set.*

In our setting we are dealing with the Benjamin-Ono equation where u_0 (and consequently u) is real-valued: hence, we only need to estimate its positive spectrum part, $\mathcal{F}_\xi^{-1}(\chi_{\xi \geq 0} \hat{u}(\xi))$, to recover u .

Later on, we will be interested in $P^+(P^\pm v P^\pm u)$, where $P^\pm$ are the spectral projectors on positive/negative frequencies. From the discussion above, we are reduced to estimating

$$\Delta_{j''k''}^+(\Delta_{j'k'}^\pm u \Delta_{jk}^+ v),$$

while knowing a priori that $j' < j$, due to the outer P^+ .

We set $j^b = \min(j, j', j'')$ and $j^\sharp = \max(j, j', j'')$ and the remaining middle one is $j^\natural$. Similarly with k , we have $k^b \leq k^\natural \leq k^\sharp$. In the next two lemmata we set $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_{L_{t, x}^2}$.

LEMMA A.3 (SOBOLEV) *We have*

$$(A.3) \quad \|\Delta_{j''k''}^+(\Delta_{j'k'}^\pm v \Delta_{jk}^+ u)\| \lesssim 2^{\frac{j^b}{2} + \frac{k^b}{2}} \|\Delta_{j'k'}^\pm v\| \|\Delta_{jk}^+ u\|.$$

Proof: The product can be written as a convolution in (τ, ξ) , which is then localized according to $\Delta_{j'', k''}^+$. We may then use Bernstein inequalities in the “right” directions using the support sizes and the shape of the boxes. The proof of the next lemma implicitly contains this one, so we do not give any details. $\square$

In some situations, we can do better than Sobolev inequalities: the usual (spatial) paraproduct splitting implies the following relations between the indices for which our function does not vanish by support considerations:

- $j \ll j'$ and $j' \sim j''$, hence $j^\flat = j$ and $j^\sharp \sim j' \sim j''$.
- $j' \ll j$ and $j \sim j''$, hence $j^\flat = j'$ and $j^\sharp \sim j \sim j''$.
- $j'' \ll j$ and $j \sim j'$, hence $j^\flat = j$ and $j^\sharp \sim j' \sim j$.
- $j \sim j' \sim j''$, hence $j^\flat \sim j^\sharp$.

LEMMA A.4 (CONORMAL REGULARITY) • Let $k'' = k^\sharp$. if $j'' \ll j \sim j'$,

$$(A.4) \quad \|\Delta_{j'' k''}^+(\Delta_{j' k'}^+ v \Delta_{j k}^+ u)\| \lesssim 2^{\frac{k^\flat}{2} + \frac{k^\sharp - j^\flat}{2}} \|\Delta_{j' k'}^+ v\| \|\Delta_{j k}^+ u\|,$$

and

$$(A.5) \quad \|\Delta_{j'' k''}^+(\Delta_{j' k'}^- v \Delta_{j k}^+ u)\| \lesssim 2^{\frac{k^\flat}{2} + \frac{k^\sharp - j^\flat}{2}} \|\Delta_{j' k'}^- v\| \|\Delta_{j k}^+ u\|.$$

If $j \sim j' \sim j''$,

$$(A.6) \quad \|\Delta_{j'' k''}^+(\Delta_{j' k'}^+ v \Delta_{j k}^+ u)\| \lesssim 2^{\frac{k^\flat}{2} + \frac{k^\sharp}{4}} \|\Delta_{j' k'}^+ v\| \|\Delta_{j k}^+ u\|.$$

- Let $k = k^\sharp$. If $j \sim j' \sim j''$,

$$(A.7) \quad \|\Delta_{j'' k''}^+(\Delta_{j' k'}^- v \Delta_{j k}^+ u)\| \lesssim 2^{\frac{k^\flat}{2} + \frac{k^\sharp}{4}} \|\Delta_{j' k'}^- v\| \|\Delta_{j k}^+ u\|.$$

- In all remaining cases, most notably including $j' \ll j \sim j''$ irrespective of $k^\sharp$,

$$(A.8) \quad \|\Delta_{j'' k''}^+(\Delta_{j' k'}^\pm v \Delta_{j k}^+ u)\| \lesssim 2^{\frac{k^\flat}{2} + \frac{k^\sharp - j^\flat}{2}} \|\Delta_{j' k'}^\pm v\| \|\Delta_{j k}^+ u\|.$$

REMARK A.5 Recall $\tau - \xi^2 - (\tau - \sigma - (\xi - \eta)^2) - (\sigma \mp \eta^2) = (\xi - \eta)^2 \pm \eta^2 - \xi^2$, and assume $k^\sharp = k''$. The left handside is clearly bounded by $2^{k''} + 2^{k'} + 2^k = O(2^{k^\sharp})$. On the right handside, we consider different cases:

- if $j'' \ll j \sim j'$, then $\xi - \eta \sim -\eta$. In the $+++$ case, we get $2j^\sharp \lesssim k^\sharp$. In the $+ - +$ case, expanding leads to $\xi\eta$ and therefore $j^\flat + j^\sharp \lesssim k^\sharp$;
- if $j' \ll j \sim j''$, similarly one gets $j^\flat + j^\sharp \lesssim k^\sharp$ in both cases;
- if $j \ll j' \sim j''$, one has to switch u and v and we are back in the previous case (note that for BO, this never happens in the $+ - +$ case);
- if $j \sim j' \sim j''$, we have $\xi \sim \xi - \eta \sim \pm\eta$ and again $2j^\sharp \sim j^\flat + j^\sharp \lesssim k^\sharp$.

Finally, if $k^\flat, k^\sharp \ll k^\sharp$, then the left handside is actually exactly $O(2^{k^\sharp})$, in which case we get either $2j^\sharp \sim k^\sharp$ ($+++$ case) or $j^\flat + j^\sharp \sim k^\sharp$ ($+ - +$ case).

Now a simple duality argument reduces the study to the case $k'' = k^\sharp$:

- if $k = k^\sharp$, then $\langle \Delta_{j''k''}^+(\Delta_{j'k'}^\pm u \Delta_{jk}^+ v), \varphi \rangle = \langle \Delta_{jk}^+ v, \Delta_{jk}^+(\Delta_{j'k'}^\mp \bar{u} \Delta_{j''k''}^+ \varphi) \rangle$ and we have to deal with $\Delta_{jk}^+(\Delta_{j'k'}^\mp \bar{u} \Delta_{j''k''}^+ \varphi)$;
- if $k' = k^\sharp$, by the same reasoning, one has to deal with $\Delta_{j'k'}^\pm(\Delta_{jk}^- \bar{v} \Delta_{j''k''}^+ \varphi)$.

REMARK A.6 *Notice now we got all possible sign combinations. However, from the symmetry with respect to $\xi = 0$, the $--+$ case is no different from $+-+$. To summarize, we will deal with $+\pm+$ with $k'' = k^\sharp$.*

We should now set k and k' : if we have the $+++$ case, by symmetry we may choose $k' \leq k$ and we are left with the paraproduct trichotomy; otherwise we get 2 separate cases. All in all, we get $3 + 3 \times 2$ possible cases. Set

$$I(\tau, \xi) = \psi_{j''k''}^+(\tau, \xi) \int f(\tau - \sigma, \xi - \eta) g(\sigma, \eta) d\sigma d\eta,$$

with f, g being the space-time Fourier transforms of two dyadic blocks of u, v . We have 2 cases:

- if $g = \mathcal{F}_{t,x} \Delta_{j'k'}^+ v$ ($+++$ case), $\tau - \xi^2 = \tau - \sigma - (\xi - \eta)^2 + \sigma - \eta^2 + 2\eta(-\xi + \eta)$, and we define $F^+(\xi, \eta) = 2\eta(-\xi + \eta) = (\xi - \eta)^2 + \eta^2 - \xi^2$.
- if $g = \mathcal{F}_{t,x} \Delta_{j'k'}^- v$ ($+-+$ case), $\tau - \xi^2 = \tau - \sigma - (\xi - \eta)^2 + \sigma + \eta^2 + ((\xi - \eta)^2 - \eta^2 - \xi^2)$ and $F^-(\xi, \eta) = (\xi - \eta)^2 - \eta^2 - \xi^2$.

We now proceed as follows.

A.1.1 Case $j'' \ll j^\sharp$: remainder

This is the product minus paraproducts and $j^\flat \sim j^\sharp$ terms. We split the support of $\hat{g}$ into non-overlapping intervals of size $2^{j''}$ (recall $j'' = j^\flat$), and the support of f will be forced into a interval of comparable length but opposite with respect to the $\xi = 0$ frequency. As such, one has to deal with

$$I = \sum_Q \phi_{j''k''}^+ f_{-Q} \star g_Q = \sum_Q I_Q.$$

We will later write (using L_ξ^2 orthogonality of $(f_Q)_Q, (g_Q)_Q$)

$$\begin{aligned} \|I\| &\leq \sum_Q \|I_Q\| \leq \sum_Q M \|f_{-Q}\| \|g_Q\| \leq M \left(\sum_Q \|f_{-Q}\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_Q \|g_Q\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim M \left\| \sum_Q f_{-Q} \right\| \left\| \sum_Q g_Q \right\| \lesssim M \|f\| \|g\|, \end{aligned}$$

where M will be obtained when evaluating I_Q in the next step.

LEMMA A.7 *Introduce a parabolic level set decomposition, where $l \in \mathbb{Z}$,*

$$(A.9) \quad \chi_l(\xi, \eta) = \chi_{l2^{k^\sharp} < F^\pm(\xi, \eta) < (l+1)2^{k^\sharp}} \text{ and } I_Q^l = \psi_{j''k''}^+ \int \chi_l \hat{f}_{-Q}(\xi - \eta, \tau - \sigma) \hat{g}_Q(\eta, \sigma) d\sigma d\eta.$$

Then the family $(I_Q^l)_l$ is almost orthogonal in $L_{\tau, \xi}^2$.

Proof: Assume (ξ, τ) is in the support of I_Q^l and I_Q^m . We shall prove that $l \sim m$. Certainly there exist (σ_1, η_1) such that

$$l2^{k^\natural} < F(\xi, \eta_1) < (l+1)2^{k^\natural} \text{ and } |\sigma_1 \mp \eta_1^2| < 2^{k'} \text{ and } |(\tau - \sigma_1) - (\xi - \eta_1)^2| < 2^k.$$

Similarly, there exist (σ_2, η_2) such that

$$m2^{k^\natural} < F(\xi, \eta_2) < (m+1)2^{k^\natural} \text{ and } |\sigma_2 \mp \eta_2^2| < 2^{k'} \text{ and } |(\tau - \sigma_2) - (\xi - \eta_2)^2| < 2^k.$$

Recall that, for any (σ, η) , we have $\tau - \xi^2 = \tau - \sigma - (\xi - \eta)^2 + \sigma \mp \eta^2 + F^\pm(\xi, \eta)$, hence

$$F^\pm(\xi, \eta_1) - F^\pm(\xi, \eta_2) = \tau - \sigma_2 - (\xi - \eta_2)^2 + \sigma_2 \mp \eta_2^2 - (\tau - \sigma_1 - (\xi - \eta_1)^2 + \sigma_1 \mp \eta_1^2).$$

Given the self-imposed bounds, the right handside is bounded by $2(2^k + 2^{k'}) = O(2^{k^\natural})$. This bounds $|F^\pm(\xi, \eta_1) - F^\pm(\xi, \eta_2)|$, but by virtue of the lower bounds on $F(\xi, \eta_1)$ and $F(\xi, \eta_2)$, this difference is bounded from below by $(l - m - 1)2^k$ if $m < l$, hence $l \sim m$. $\square$

We can now perform Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$(A.10) \quad I_Q^l(\xi, \tau) \leq \left(\int_{A(Q, j', k', \xi, \tau)} \chi_l(\xi, \eta) d\sigma d\eta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\sigma, \eta} \chi_l(\xi, \eta) |f_{-Q}|^2 |g_Q|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where

$$A(Q, j', k', \xi, \tau) = \{(\sigma, \eta), \eta \in Q, |\eta| \sim 2^{j'}, |\sigma \mp \eta^2| \sim 2^{k'}, |\tau - \sigma - (\xi - \eta)^2| \sim 2^k\}.$$

We need to bound $M^2 = \int_A \chi_l$; we start with integration w.r.t. σ : one cannot improve upon what the support size yields; namely, at fixed (η, ξ, τ) , the interval is at most $\min(2^{k'}, 2^k) = 2^{k^\natural}$. Now for the integration w.r.t. η , one has an integral over a domain B , with fixed (ξ, τ) ,

$$B = \{\eta \in Q, |\eta| \sim 2^{j'}, l2^{k^\natural} < F^\pm(\xi, \eta) < (l+1)2^{k^\natural}\}.$$

We have to deal separately with the two cases, knowing that at any rate, η is in an interval of size $2^{j''}$ (which yields Sobolev !):

- either F^- , namely $l2^{k^\natural} < -2\xi\eta < (l+1)2^{k^\natural}$. As such, η is in an interval of size $2^{k^\natural}/|\xi| \sim 2^{k^\natural-j''}$ and we obtain $M \lesssim 2^{\frac{k^\natural}{2} + \frac{k^\natural-j''}{2}}$.
- either F^+ , namely $l2^{k^\natural} < 2\eta^2 - 2\xi\eta < (l+1)2^{k^\natural}$. Note that (as $|\eta| \sim 2^{j'} \gg 2^{j''} \sim |\xi|$), $2^{2j'} \lesssim F^+$, and therefore $|\xi|^2 \ll l2^{k^\natural}$. We have

$$|\eta_{\max} - \eta_{\min}| \leq \sqrt{(l+1)2^{k^\natural-1} + \frac{\xi^2}{4}} - \sqrt{l2^{k^\natural-1} + \frac{\xi^2}{4}} \leq \frac{2^{k^\natural}}{\sqrt{(l+1)2^{k^\natural} + \frac{\xi^2}{4}}} \lesssim \frac{2^{k^\natural}}{\sqrt{2^{2j'}}}.$$

Therefore η is in an interval of size at most $2^{\frac{k^\natural-j''}{2}}$, and we obtain $M \lesssim 2^{\frac{k^\natural}{2} + \frac{k^\natural-j''}{2}}$.

>From (A.10), we have

$$\|I_Q\|^2 \leq \sum_l \int_{\xi, \tau} I_l^2 \leq M^2 \int_{\xi, \tau, \sigma, \eta} |f_{-Q}|^2 (\xi - \eta, \tau - \sigma) |g_Q|^2 (\eta, \sigma) \leq M^2 \|f_{-Q}\|^2 \|g_Q\|^2.$$

A.1.2 Case $j^b \sim j^\sharp$

We write (with $\eta = \xi/2 + \lambda$)

$$I(\tau, \xi) = \phi_{j''k''}^+ \int f(\tau - \sigma, \frac{\xi}{2} - \lambda) g(\sigma, \frac{\xi}{2} + \lambda) d\sigma d\lambda.$$

Now $F^+ = 2\lambda^2 - \xi^2/2$ and $F^- = -2\lambda\xi - \xi^2$. Again, define level sets with $l2^{k^\sharp} < F^\pm < (l+1)2^{k^\sharp}$ and with the characteristic function χ_l . We are led to $M^2 = \int_{\sigma, \lambda} \chi_l$, and a situation which is very similar to the reminder situation.

- If we have F^- , the λ interval will be of size at most $2^{k^\sharp}/|\xi|$, which yields $M \lesssim 2^{\frac{k^b}{2} + \frac{k^\sharp - j^\sharp}{2}}$.
- If we have F^+ , the situation is worse: unlike in previous cases, F^+ may very well be close to zero when λ varies. We have $l2^{k^\sharp-1} + \frac{\xi^2}{2} < \lambda^2 < (l+1)2^{k^\sharp-1} + \frac{\xi^2}{2}$. Either $l = 0$ and λ varies in an interval of size $2^{\frac{k^\sharp}{2}}$, or $l \neq 0$ and either $\frac{\xi^2}{4} + l2^{k^\sharp-1} < 2^{k^\sharp}$, and we conclude

$$|\eta_{\max} - \eta_{\min}| \leq \left| \sqrt{(1+l)2^{k^\sharp-1} + \frac{\xi^2}{4}} - \sqrt{l2^{k^\sharp-1} + \frac{\xi^2}{4}} \right| \lesssim 2^{\frac{k^\sharp}{2}}$$

or $\frac{\xi^2}{4} + l2^{k^\sharp-1} > 2^{k^\sharp}$ and we conclude by

$$|\eta_{\max} - \eta_{\min}| \leq \frac{2^{k^\sharp}}{\sqrt{l2^{k^\sharp-1} + \frac{\xi^2}{4}}} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k^\sharp}{2}}.$$

Finally, we get $M \lesssim 2^{\frac{k^b}{2} + \frac{k^\sharp}{4}}$.

A.1.3 Case $j' \ll j'' \sim j \sim j^\sharp$: paraproduct

We still proceed with the same computation as before (without introducing the intervals Q). Here, we have $|\eta| \sim 2^{j'}$.

LEMMA A.8 *We consider again the parabolic level set decomposition,*

$$\chi_l(\xi, \eta) = \chi_{l2^{k^\sharp} < F^\pm(\xi, \eta) < (l+1)2^{k^\sharp}} \text{ and } I^l = \psi_{j''k''}^+ \int \chi_l f(\xi - \eta, \tau - \sigma) g(\eta, \sigma) d\sigma d\eta.$$

The family $(I^l)_l$ is almost orthogonal in $L^2_{\tau, xi}$.

the proof is word for word identical to the previous case: we never used any support condition in ξ or η . $\square$

Perform Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$I^l(\xi, \tau) \leq \left(\sup_{\xi, \tau} \int_{B(Q, j', k', \xi, \tau)} \chi_l(\xi, \eta) d\sigma d\eta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\eta, \sigma} \chi_l(\xi, \eta) |f|^2 |g|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where

$$B(Q, j', k', \xi, \tau) = \{(\sigma, \eta), |\eta| \sim 2^{j'} |\sigma \mp \eta^2| \sim 2^{k'}, |\tau - \sigma - (\xi - \eta)^2| \sim 2^k\}.$$

Again, at fixed (η, ξ, τ) , the interval in σ is at most $\min(2^{k'}, 2^k) = 2^{k^b}$. For η , we have

$$B = \{\eta \in Q, |\eta| \sim 2^{j'}, l2^{k^\sharp} < F^\pm(\xi, \eta) < (l+1)2^{k^\sharp}\}.$$

Split the two cases, knowing η is at most in an interval of size $2^{j'}$ (which is Sobolev):

- either F^- , namely $l2^{k^\sharp} < -2\xi\eta < (l+1)2^{k^\sharp}$. As such, η is in an interval of size $2^{k^\sharp}/|\xi| \sim 2^{k^\sharp-j}$. This yields again $M \lesssim 2^{\frac{k^b}{2} + \frac{k^\sharp-j}{2}}$.
- either F^+ , namely $l2^{k^\sharp} < 2\eta^2 - 2\xi\eta < (l+1)2^{k^\sharp}$. Now, as $|\eta| \sim 2^{j'} \ll 2^j \sim |\xi|$, $|F^+| \sim 2^{j+j'+1}$.

Assume $\eta\xi < 0$ (which never happens for BO) then $l > 0$ and

$$|\eta_{\max} - \eta_{\min}| \leq \sqrt{(l+1)2^{k^\sharp-1} + \frac{\xi^2}{4}} - \sqrt{l2^{k^\sharp-1} + \frac{\xi^2}{4}} \leq \frac{2^{k^\sharp}}{4\sqrt{l2^{k^\sharp-1} + \frac{\xi^2}{4}}} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k^\sharp-j}{2}}.$$

and η is again in an interval of size at most $2^{\frac{k^\sharp-j}{2}}$ and $M \lesssim 2^{\frac{k^b}{2} + \frac{k^\sharp-j}{2}}$.

Assume now $\eta\xi > 0$, this forces $k^\sharp \lesssim j + j'$ or the η -set is empty, and $-l \sim 2^{j+j'+1-k^\sharp}$. Call $m = -l > 0$:

$$-m2^{k^\sharp} < 2\eta^2 - 2\xi\eta < (-m+1)2^{k^\sharp},$$

and remark that $(-m+1)2^{k^\sharp-1} + \frac{\xi^2}{4} \geq (\eta - \frac{\xi}{2})^2 \sim 2^{2j}$. Hence

$$|\eta_{\max} - \eta_{\min}| \leq \frac{2^{k^\sharp}}{4\sqrt{(-m+1)2^{k^\sharp-1} + \frac{\xi^2}{4}}} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k^\sharp-j}{2}}.$$

and $M \lesssim 2^{\frac{k^b}{2} + \frac{k^\sharp-j}{2}}$. Summing the l pieces is the same as before (except we have no Q).

A.1.4 Case $j'' \sim j' \sim j^\sharp$: paraproduct

One may just reverse the order of f and g in the convolution to get the very same result as in the previous case: this will be obvious for the $+++$ case, while for $+ - +$, we have a shifted $F^- = 2\xi\eta - 2\xi^2$ to which the same computation applies.

A.2 Product estimates

Recall the paraproduct decomposition: $uv = T_v u + T_u v + R(u, v)$, where we define

$$T_v u = \sum_j S_{j-1} v \Delta_j u, \quad \text{and} \quad R(u, v) = \sum_{|j-j'| \leq 1} \Delta_j v \Delta_{j'} u.$$

In this section we prove all important bilinear estimates. We first state the estimates required to obtain the existence and uniqueness in $H^s, s > 1/4$.

PROPOSITION A.9 *Let $u \in X^{s,b,q}$ and $v \in X^{s',\frac{1}{2},1}$. We consider the mapping $w = P^+(P^\pm v P^+ u)$.*

- Assume moreover that $s + s' \geq -\frac{1}{2}$, we have

– if $b = \frac{1}{2}, q = 1$:

$$(A.11) \quad \partial_x P^+(R(P^\pm v P^+ u)) \in X^{s+s', -\frac{1}{2}, 1}.$$

– if $s' = 0, s > \frac{1}{4}, b > \frac{1}{2}, q = 2$:

$$(A.12) \quad \partial_x P^+(R(P^\pm v P^+ u)) \in X^{s,b-1,2} + X^{s,\frac{1}{2},1}.$$

Assume moreover that $s' + \frac{1}{2} \leq 0$, then

- if $b = \frac{1}{2}$, $q = 1$:

$$(A.13) \quad P^+(T_{P^\pm v} P^+ u) \in X^{s+s'+1, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}.$$

- if $b > \frac{1}{2}$, $q = 2$:

$$(A.14) \quad P^+(T_{P^\pm v} P^+ u) \in X^{s+s'+1, b-1, 2} + X^{s+s'+1, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}.$$

We shall also need the following refinement when dealing with the unconditional uniqueness in $L_t^\infty(H^{1/2})$.

PROPOSITION A.10 *Let $u \in X^{s, \frac{1}{2}, 2}$ and $v \in X^{-1, \frac{1}{2}, 2}$. Then we have*

$$(A.15) \quad P^+(T_{P^\pm v} P^+ u) \in X^{s, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}.$$

Let $u \in X^{-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$ and $v \in X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 2} \cap X^{0, \frac{1}{4}, 1}$. Then we have

$$(A.16) \quad \partial_x P^+(R(P^\pm v P^+ u)) \in X^{-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}.$$

Proof: We expand all functions dyadically, and are therefore left with estimating

$$\sum_{j'', k''} \Delta_{j'', k''}^+ \left(\sum_{j', j, k', k} \Delta_{j', k'}^\pm v \times \Delta_{j, k}^+ u \right).$$

We set

$$\|\Delta_{j, k}^+ u\| \leq \beta_{jk} 2^{-js-kb}, \quad \|\Delta_{j', k'}^\pm v\| \leq \alpha_{j'k'} 2^{-j's'-k'b'}$$
 with $\alpha, \beta \in l^1(j, k)$.

Obviously, in the $+-$ case, the first constraint is $j' < j$ otherwise by support condition (the P^+ in front of the product) it vanishes. In the $++$ case, both functions u, v play identical role and therefore we consider only two terms in the usual spatial paraproduct decomposition (discarding $T_u v$). Given that for $b > \frac{1}{2}$, we obviously have $X_{\pm}^{s, b, 1} \hookrightarrow X_{\pm}^{s, \frac{1}{2}, 1}$, we will perform interpolation to recover (most of the) $q > 1$ cases (which are useful for propagation of Sobolev regularity and unconditional uniqueness). In most instances, $b = b' = \frac{1}{2}$, but we will occasionally set b or b' to be $0, \frac{1}{4}$, or $\frac{3}{4}$.

A.2.1 The remainder of the spatial paraproduct: $j' \sim j \sim j^\sharp$ and $j'' = j^\flat$

Here it should be obvious that only the sum of the two regularities will be of importance, given the $j \sim j'$ condition. We accordingly set $\sigma = s + s' + \frac{1}{2}$, the case $\sigma = 0$ being the borderline (worst) case, and the situation improving with $\sigma > 0$ which provides better summability in several instances. Start with the $-+$ case: we have $j'' + j \lesssim k^\sharp$ from the dispersion relation; either $j'' + j \sim k^\sharp$ or $k^\sharp \sim k^\flat$. We consider 3 cases, depending on $k^\sharp$.

1. $k'' = k^\sharp$: then we have $2j'' \lesssim j + j'' \lesssim k''$. We deal with both $j'' \ll j$ and $j'' \sim j$. Pick the conormal factor from (A.5), we get

$$c_{j'', k''} \lesssim \sum_{k, k' \lesssim k''} \sum_{j'' \lesssim j \lesssim k'' - j''} 2^{\frac{k+k'}{2} - \frac{j''}{2} - j(s+s') - k'b' - kb} \alpha_{j, k'} \beta_{j, k}.$$

Given $b, b' \geq \frac{1}{2}$, we simply use $\alpha \in l^\infty(k')$ and $\beta \in l^\infty(k)$ to get k''^2 for the k, k' sums, and $s + s' + \frac{1}{2} \geq 0$ to get, if $s + s' > 0$,

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{-\sigma j''} (k'' - 2j'') k''^2 \lesssim 2^{(\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon)k''} 2^{-(1-4\epsilon+\sigma)j''} (k'' - 2j'') k''^2 2^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}k'' - \epsilon j''},$$

where, as $2j'' \lesssim k''$, we trade conormal regularity for spatial regularity, and regain k'', j'' summability ($\epsilon > 0$ is small). If $s + s' < 0$,

$$(A.17) \quad c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{-\frac{j''}{2}} (k'' - 2j'') k''^2 2^{-(s+s')(k''-j'')} \\ \lesssim 2^{(\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon)k''} 2^{-(1-4\epsilon+\sigma)j''} 2^{\sigma(2j''-k'')} (k'' - 2j'') k''^2 2^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}k'' - \epsilon j''}.$$

Therefore, the output is $X^{\frac{3}{2}+s+s'-4\epsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 1} \chi_{2j'' \lesssim k''}$.

2. $k = k^\#$ then $k \gg 2j''$, and we have to sum over $k > k''$, $k' < k$ and $j'' < j < k - j''$. First, we deal with $j'' \ll j$: we have

$$c_{j'', k''} \lesssim \sum_{k'' \lesssim k, k' \lesssim k} \sum_{j'' \lesssim j \lesssim k - j''} 2^{\frac{k''}{2} + \inf(\frac{j''}{2}, \frac{k'' - j''}{2}) - j(s+s') - kb - k'b'} \alpha_{j, k'} \beta_{j, k}.$$

(a) We restrict the sum to $k' < k''$:

- if $k'' \ll k$, $j \sim k - j''$, and conormal is better ($k'' - j \lesssim j''$),

$$c_{j'', k''} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{2} + j''(\frac{1}{2} + s + s')} \sum_{k > \sup(k'', 2j'')} 2^{-k(s+s'+b+\frac{1}{2})} \beta_{k-j'', k} \sum_{k' < k''} 2^{k'(\frac{1}{2} - b')} \alpha_{k-j'', k'}.$$

Now, if $\alpha, \beta \in l^\infty$ and $b' = \frac{1}{2}$, the last sum is less than k'' , and the first sum is finite because $s + s' + b \geq 0$,

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{2} + \sigma j''} 2^{-(\sigma+b) \sup(k'', 2j'')} k'' \lesssim 2^{k''(\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon)} 2^{-j''(1+\sigma-4\epsilon)} 2^{-k''\frac{\epsilon}{2} - j''\epsilon} k'',$$

where again we may trade conormal regularity for spatial regularity, depending on $\sup(k'', 2j'')$. Therefore, the output is $X^{\frac{3}{2}+s+s'-4\epsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 1}$.

- if $k \sim k''$, $j < k'' - j''$, which means Sobolev is better:

$$c_{j'', k''} \sim \sum_{k' \lesssim k''} \sum_{j'' \lesssim j \lesssim k'' - j''} 2^{\frac{k'}{2} + \frac{j''}{2} - j(s+s') - k''b - k'b'} \alpha_{j, k'} \beta_{j, k''}.$$

With $b' = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\alpha \in l^\infty$, the first sum yields k'' . Either $s + s' \geq 0$ and we get

$$c_{j'', k''} \lesssim 2^{\frac{j''}{2} - bk'' - j''(s+s')} k'' (k'' - 2j''),$$

or $s + s' < 0$ and we get

$$c_{j'', k''} \lesssim 2^{\frac{j''}{2} - bk'' + (k'' - j'')(-s - s')} k'',$$

where we only used $\beta \in l^\infty$. Assume $j'' < k''/2$, trading conormal regularity for spatial regularity yields

$$c_{j'', k''} \lesssim 2^{-(s+s'+2b+\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon)j''} 2^{(\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon)k''} (k'' - 2j'') k'' 2^{-\frac{\epsilon}{4}k'' - \frac{\epsilon}{2}j''},$$

hence the output is $X^{\frac{3}{2}+s+s'-2\epsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 1}$.

If $j'' > k''/2$, from $k \sim k''$ and $j \ll k - j''$ we get $k'' \sim 2j''$, and $j \sim j''$, hence this case will be treated later (recall we are in a situation where $j'' \ll j$).

(b) Now we deal with $k'' < k' < k$:

- if $j'' < k'/2$, pick Sobolev, and

$$c_{j'',k''} = 2^{\frac{j''}{2} + \frac{k''}{2}} \sum_{\sup(k'', 2j'') < k} \sum_{j'' < j < k-j''} 2^{-j(s+s')-kb} \beta_{j,k} \sum_{\sup(k'', 2j'') < k' < k} 2^{-k'b'} \alpha_{j,k'}.$$

When $s + s' > 0$, one gets (discarding any summability in α, β)

$$c_{j'',k''} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{2}} 2^{-j''(s+s'-\frac{1}{2})} 2^{-(b+b') \sup(k'', 2j'')},$$

while when $s + s' < 0$, $s + s' + b \geq 0$ and $\beta \in l^1$, we get

$$c_{j'',k''} \leq 2^{k''/2 + \sigma j'' - \sup(k'', 2j'')(s+s'+b+b')}$$

therefore, the output is $X^{s+s'+2b+2b'-\frac{1}{2}-4\epsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 1}$.

- if $j'' > k'/2$,

$$(A.18) \quad c_{j'',k''} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{2}} \sum_{\sup(k'', 2j'') < k} 2^{-kb} \sum_{j'' < j < k-j''} 2^{-j(s+s')} \beta_{j,k} \sum_{k'' < k' < \inf(k, 2j'')} 2^{-b'k'} \alpha_{j,k'} 2^{\inf(\frac{j''}{2}, \frac{k'-j}{2})}.$$

which is non-zero only if $k'' < 2j''$.

- either $k' < k$ and $j \sim k - j''$, conormal is better,

$$c_{j'',k''} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{2} + j''(\frac{1}{2} + s + s')} \sum_{k > 2j''} 2^{-k(s+s'+b+\frac{1}{2})} \beta_{k-j'',k} \sum_{k'' < k' < k} 2^{k'(\frac{1}{2} - b')} \alpha_{k-j'',k'}.$$

Assume $\alpha, \beta \in l^\infty$, then, as $s + s' + b + \frac{1}{2} > 0$,

$$c_{j'',k''} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{2} + \sigma j''} 2^{-2j''(\sigma+b)} k'',$$

and the output is $X^{s+s'+2b+\frac{1}{2}-4\epsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 1}$.

- Either $k' \sim k$ and $j < k - j''$. Then Sobolev is better,

$$c_{j'',k''} \lesssim 2^{(k''+j'')/2} \sum_{\sup(2j'', k'') < k} 2^{-k(b+b')} \sum_{j'' < j < k-j''} 2^{-j(s+s')} \beta_{j,k} \alpha_{j,k}.$$

Discarding summability over α, β and setting $b + b' = 1$, either $s + s' > 0$ and we get

$$c_{j'',k''} \lesssim 2^{(k''+j'')/2} 2^{-\sup(2j'', k'')} 2^{-(s+s')j''},$$

which is $X^{s+s'+\frac{3}{2}-4\epsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 1}$,

or $s + s' < 0$ and we get (recall $s + s' + 1 > 0$)

$$c_{j'',k''} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{2}} 2^{-\sup(2j'', k'')(1+s+s')} 2^{\sigma j''},$$

which yields again $X^{s+s'+\frac{3}{2}-4\epsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 1}$.

We are left with $j \sim j' \sim j''$: we have

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim \sum_{k'', k' \leq k} 2^{\frac{k^b}{2} + \inf(\frac{j''}{2}, \frac{k^b}{4}) - j''(s+s') - kb - k'b'} \alpha_{j''k'} \beta_{j''k}.$$

- Assume $k' < k''$:
 - if $j'' < \frac{k''}{2}$, Sobolev is better,

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{-(s+s'-\frac{1}{2})j''} \sum_{k' < k'' \leq k} 2^{-kb + (\frac{1}{2}-b')k'} \alpha_{j''k'} \beta_{j''k}$$

which, discarding summability, yields

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{-(s+s'-\frac{1}{2})j''} 2^{-bk''} k'',$$

and trading regularity, the output is $X^{s+s'+\frac{3}{2}-4\varepsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon, 1}$,

- if $j'' > \frac{k''}{2}$, conormal is better, (notice we may use $k'' < 2j'' - C$ with a large C in this term and the previous one, should it be helpful)

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{4} - (s+s')j''} \sum_{k' < k'' < 2j'' < k} 2^{-kb + (\frac{1}{2}-b')k'} \alpha_{j''k'} \beta_{j''k}$$

which, assuming $\alpha, \beta \in l^1$, $b' = \frac{1}{2}$ is $X^{s+s'+2b, -\frac{1}{4}, 1}$. Notice that if $b' = \frac{1}{4}$, then the output is $X^{s+s'+2b, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$.

- Assume $k'' < k'$:
 - if $j'' < \frac{k'}{2}$, Sobolev is better,

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{-(s+s'-\frac{1}{2})j'' + \frac{k''}{2}} \sum_{\sup(k'', 2j'') < k' \leq k} 2^{-kb - b'k'} \alpha_{j''k'} \beta_{j''k}$$

which, discarding summability, yields

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{-(s+s'-\frac{1}{2})j''} 2^{\frac{k''}{2} - (b+b') \sup(k'', 2j'')} k'',$$

and the output is $X^{s+s'+\frac{3}{2}-4\varepsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon, 1}$,

- if $j'' > \frac{k'}{2}$, conormal is better,

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{2} - (s+s')j''} \sum_{k'' < k' < 2j'' < k} 2^{-kb + (\frac{1}{4}-b')k'} \alpha_{j''k'} \beta_{j''k}$$

which, assuming $\alpha, \beta \in l^1$, $b' = \frac{1}{2}$ is $X^{s+s'+2b, -\frac{1}{4}, 1}$. Notice again that if $b' = \frac{1}{4}$, then the output is $X^{s+s'+2b, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$.

REMARK A.11 Both last situations where $j'' > k^b/2$ define the R_2 term in the section on existence when $s < \frac{1}{4}$. The gain depends on b (regularity $s + s' + 2b$) and one may set $b' = 0, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}$, with respective outputs having $b'' = -1, -\frac{3}{4}, -\frac{1}{2}$

3. Finally, $k' = k^\sharp$: notice the conormal factors are identical whether $j'' \ll j$ or $j'' \sim j$, and we obtain exactly the same result as $k = k^\sharp$ when $j'' \ll j$.

Proceed with the $++$ case: we have, by support considerations, $j^b \sim j^\sharp$, and $2j'' \lesssim k^\sharp$ from the dispersion relation and we consider 3 cases.

1. $k'' = k^\sharp$: assume $k, k' \ll k''$, then $2j'' \sim k''$,

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim \sum_{k, k' < k''} \inf(2^{\frac{k^b}{2} + \frac{j''}{2}}, 2^{\frac{k^b}{2} + \frac{k^b}{4}}) \alpha_{j''k'} 2^{-j''s' - k'b'} \beta_{j''k} 2^{-j''s - kb}.$$

Assume $k < k'$,

- if $k' < 2j''$, the conormal factor is better,

$$c_{j'', k''} \lesssim 2^{-j''(s+s')} \sum_{k < k' < k''} 2^{\frac{k'}{4} + \frac{k}{2} - k'b' - kb} \alpha_{j'', k'} \beta_{j'', k}.$$

Given $b = \frac{1}{2}$ and $b' = \frac{1}{4}$ (or the other way around), use $\alpha, \beta \in l^1$, to get (trading regularity)

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{-j''(s+s'+1) + \frac{k''}{2}} \lambda_{j''k''},$$

and the output is $X^{s+s'+1, -\frac{1}{2}, 1} \chi_{2j'' \sim k''}$;

REMARK A.12 *This defines the R_3 term in the section on existence below $s = \frac{1}{4}$.*

- if $2j'' < k'$, Sobolev is better,

$$c_{j'', k''} \lesssim 2^{-j''(s+s' - \frac{1}{2})} \sum_{k < k', 2j'' < k'} 2^{\frac{k}{2} - k'b' - kb} \alpha_{j'', k'} \beta_{j'', k}.$$

Given $b = b' = \frac{1}{2}$ and discarding summability we get (trading regularity)

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{-j''(s+s'+2b'+\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon) + (\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon)k''} \lambda_{j''k''},$$

with $\lambda \in l^1$, and the output is $X^{s+s'+\frac{3}{2}-\varepsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon, 1}$.

On the other hand, assume $k < k' \sim k''$, then $2j'' \ll k''$ and Sobolev is better, hence

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{-j''(s+s' - \frac{1}{2})} 2^{-b'k''} \sum_{k < k''} 2^{(\frac{1}{2}-b)k} \alpha_{j'', k''} \beta_{j'', k},$$

and with $\alpha, \beta \in l^\infty$ and $b = 1/2$, we get $X^{s+s'+2b'+\frac{1}{2}-4\varepsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon, 1} \chi_{2j'' < k''}$.

2. $k = k^\sharp$, we have $2j'' \lesssim k$. We have

$$c_{j'', k''} \lesssim \sum_{k'' < k, k' < k} 2^{\frac{k^b}{2} + \inf(\frac{j''}{2}, \frac{k^b - j''}{2}) - j''(s+s') - kb - k'b'} \alpha_{j'', k'} \beta_{j'', k}.$$

- (a) We restrict the sum to $k' < k''$:

- if $j'' < k''/2$, Sobolev is better than conormal,

$$c_{j'', k''} \lesssim 2^{-j''(s+s' - \frac{1}{2})} \sum_{k > k''} 2^{-kb} \beta_{j'', k} \sum_{k' < k''} 2^{k'(\frac{1}{2}-b')} \alpha_{j'', k'}.$$

Now the last sum yields k'' , and we get with $b \geq \frac{1}{2}$,

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{-(s+s'-\frac{1}{2})j''} 2^{-bk''} k'',$$

and again we may trade conormal regularity for spatial regularity, as $k'' \geq 2j''$:

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{(\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon)k''} 2^{-j''(s+s'+1)} k'' 2^{-k''(\frac{1}{2}+b-\epsilon)+\frac{3}{2}j''}.$$

Therefore, the output is $X^{s+s'+2b+\frac{1}{2}-4\epsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 1} \chi_{2j'' \lesssim k''}$.

- if $j'' > k''/2$, conormal is better (and recall $k \gg 2j''$),

$$c_{j'',k''} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{2}} 2^{-j''(s+s'+\frac{1}{2})} \sum_{k > 2j''} 2^{-bk} \beta_{j'',k} \sum_{k' < k''} 2^{k'(\frac{1}{2}-b')} \alpha_{j'',k'}.$$

The last sum is again k'' , and

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{2}} 2^{-j''(s+s'+\frac{1}{2}+2b)} k'',$$

therefore, the output is $X^{s+s'+2b+\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 1} \chi_{k'' < 2j''}$.

(b) Now we deal with $k'' < k' < k$:

- if $j'' < k'/2$, Sobolev is better,

$$c_{j'',k''} = 2^{\frac{k''}{2}} 2^{-j''(s+s'-\frac{1}{2})} \sum_{k > \sup(k'', 2j'')} 2^{-kb} \beta_{j'',k} \sum_{\sup(k'', 2j'') < k' < k} 2^{-b'k} \alpha_{j'',k'}.$$

and

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{k''/2-(s+s'-\frac{1}{2})j''-(b+b')\sup(k'', 2j'')},$$

which is in $X^{s+s'+\frac{3}{2}-4\epsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 1}$ as $b, b' \geq \frac{1}{2}$.

- if $j'' > k'/2$, conormal is better,

$$c_{j'',k''} = 2^{\frac{k''}{2}} 2^{-j''(\frac{1}{2}+s+s')} \sum_{k > \sup(k'', 2j'')} 2^{-kb} \beta_{j'',k} \sum_{k'' < k' < k} 2^{(\frac{1}{2}-b')k} \alpha_{j'',k'}.$$

Therefore

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{(\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon)k''-(s+s'+\frac{1}{2}+2(b-2\epsilon))j''},$$

and the output is $X^{s+s'+\frac{1}{2}+2(b-2\epsilon)-\epsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 1}$.

3. Finally, $k' = k^\sharp$: we have $2j'' \lesssim k'$, and use the conormal factor.

$$c_{j''k''} = 2^{\frac{k''}{2}-j''(\frac{1}{2}+s+s')} \sum_{\sup(k'', 2j'') < k'} \alpha_{j'',k'} 2^{-b'k'} \sum_{k < k''} 2^{k(\frac{1}{2}-b)} \beta_{j'',k}.$$

The last sum is (again) k'' , and

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{k''(\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon)-j''(\frac{1}{2}+s+s'-2\epsilon+2b')},$$

therefore, the output is $X^{\frac{1}{2}+2b'+s+s'-4\epsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 1} \hookrightarrow X^{\frac{3}{2}+s+s'-4\epsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 1}$.

We can now collect all cases to obtain that for any $\epsilon < \frac{1}{10}$,

$$R(u, v) \in X^{1+s+s', -\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 1}.$$

Therefore, we have obtained the two cases of interest:

- If $s = \frac{1}{4}$, $s' = 0$ and $b = b' = \frac{1}{2}$, $\partial_x R(u, v) \in X^{\frac{1}{4}, -\frac{1}{2}, 1}$.
- If $s > \frac{1}{4}$ and $b > \frac{1}{2}$, $s' = 0$ and $b' = \frac{1}{2}$, one has $\partial_x R(u, v) \in X^{s, -\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 1}$, except for very specific cases where $j \sim j' \sim j''$. Let us postpone them: by interpolation, $X^{s_\theta, b, 2} \subset [X^{s_1, b, 1}, X^{s_2, b, 1}]_\theta$, we get the desired estimate, $\partial_x R(X^{s, b, 2}, X^{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1}) \mapsto X^{s, -\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 2}$. On the remaining terms, they really require only $\beta \in l^2$ provided $b' > \frac{1}{4}$ (to recover $b - \frac{1}{2}$ at the end).

A.2.2 The spatial paraproduct: $j \sim j'' \sim j^\sharp$

Here, the value of s should be irrelevant: depending on s' , we might gain regularity ($s' = -3/4$, gain $\frac{1}{4}$), just be even ($s' = -1$), or have a loss ($s' < -1$). Hence the final regularity should be $s + 1 + s' = \sigma$.

>From the dispersion relation we have $j' + j'' \lesssim k^\sharp$. We split between values of $k^\sharp$ as before, treating both $\pm +$ cases.

1. Case $k'' = k^\sharp$. Note that j' and $k^\sharp - j^\sharp = k^\sharp - j''$ are not comparable a priori, thus Sobolev may be better.
 - If $k < k' \ll k''$, we have $j' \sim k'' - j''$ and the conormal factor is always better, as $k'' - j'' > k' - j''$, hence

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim \sum_{k < k' < k''} 2^{\frac{k}{2} + \frac{k' - j''}{2}} 2^{-j''s - (k'' - j'')s'} 2^{-bk - b'k'} \alpha_{k'' - j'', k'} \beta_{j'', k},$$

for which summing over k, k' yields

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim \sum_{k < k' < k''} 2^{\frac{k}{2} + \frac{k' - j''}{2}} 2^{-j''s - (k'' - j'')s'} 2^{-bk - b'k'} \alpha_{k'' - j'', k'} \beta_{j'', k},$$

discarding any summability in k, k' to get

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{j''(-\frac{1}{2} - s + s') - k''s'k''/2} \lesssim 2^{j''(-\frac{1}{2} - s + s') - k''(s' + \frac{1}{2}) + \frac{k''}{2}} k''/2,$$

and given that $k'' < 2j''$, with $s' + \frac{1}{2} \leq 0$ we obtain

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{j''(-\frac{3}{2} - s - s' - 3\epsilon) + k''(\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon)} \lambda_{j'', k''}, \text{ with } \lambda \in l^1.$$

Therefore the output is $X^{\frac{3}{2} + s + s' - 3\epsilon, -\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon, 1} \chi_{k'' < 2j''}$.

- If $k < k' \sim k''$, then Sobolev is better as $j' < k'' - j''$, and

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim \sum_{k < k''} \sum_{j' < \sup(j'', k'' - j'')} 2^{\frac{k}{2} + \frac{j' - j''}{2} - j''s - j's' - bk - b'k''} \alpha_{j'k'', k''} \beta_{j''k},$$

therefore, with $-s' + \frac{1}{2} > 0$, and discarding the k sum ($b \geq 1/2$)

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{-j''s - bk''} \alpha_{\inf(j'', k'' - j''), k''} 2^{(\frac{1}{2} - s') \inf(j'', k'' - j'')} k''.$$

– If $j'' < k'' - j''$, then

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{-j''(s + s' + \frac{3}{2} - 4\epsilon) + k''(\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon)} \lambda_{k'', j''}, \text{ with } \lambda \in l^1,$$

and the output is $X^{s + s' + \frac{3}{2} - 4\epsilon, -\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon, 1} \chi_{2j'' < k''}$.

– If $k'' < 2j''$, then

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{-j''(s-s'+\frac{1}{2})+\frac{k''}{2}-(b'+s')k''} \alpha_{k''-j'',k''}.$$

If $s' + \frac{1}{2} = 0$, one gets $X^{s+1, -\frac{1}{2}, 1} \chi_{k'' < 2j''}$.

If $s' < -\frac{1}{2}$ and discarding summability in α, β , then

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{-j''(s+s'+\frac{3}{2})+\frac{k''}{2}+k''((-s')-b')-j''((-2s')-1)k''},$$

and with $b' = \frac{1}{2}$ and $k'' < 2j''$, we get $X^{\frac{3}{2}+s+s'-3\epsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 1} \chi_{k'' < 2j''}$.

- If $k' < k < k''$, then $j' \sim k'' - j''$, pick the conormal factor,

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim \sum_{k' < k < k''} 2^{\frac{k'}{2}+\frac{k-j''}{2}} 2^{-j''s-(k''-j'')s'} 2^{-bk-b'k'} \alpha_{k''-j'',k'} \beta_{j'',k},$$

and, exactly as before, discarding any summability

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{-j''(s-s'+\frac{1}{2})} 2^{-s'k''} k''^2,$$

taking advantage of $k'' < 2j''$, we get $X^{s+s'+\frac{3}{2}-3\epsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 1} \chi_{k'' < 2j''}$.

- If $k' < k \sim k''$, then $j' < k'' - j''$, Sobolev is better, and we have

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim \sum_{k' < k''} \sum_{j' < \inf(j'', k''-j'')} 2^{\frac{k'}{2}+\frac{j'}{2}-j''s-j's'-bk-bk''} \alpha_{j',k'} \beta_{j'',k},$$

which is even slightly better than the $k < k' \sim k''$.

2. Case $k = k^\sharp$: we have

$$c_{j''k''} = \sum_{k', k'' < k} \sum_{j' < k-j''} 2^{\frac{k^\sharp}{2}+\inf(\frac{j'}{2}, \frac{k^\sharp-j''}{2})} 2^{-j''s-j's'-kb-k'b'} \alpha_{j',k'} \beta_{j'',k}.$$

- If $k' < k'' < k$, then $j' \sim k - j''$, pick the conormal factor,

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{2}-j''(s-s'+\frac{1}{2})} \sum_{k' < k'' < k < 2j''} 2^{-ks'-kb} 2^{\frac{k'}{2}-b'k'} \alpha_{k-j'',k'} \beta_{j'',k}.$$

The sum over k' is irrelevant, assuming again $s' + b \leq 0$, we get, with no summability over α, β

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{2}-j''(s+s'+\frac{1}{2}+2b)} 2j''k'',$$

which means the output is $X^{s+s'+2b+\frac{1}{2}-3\epsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 1} \chi_{k'' < 2j''}$.

- If $k' < k'' \sim k$, we are back in a case where $k^\sharp \sim k''$.
- If $k'' < k' < k$, then $j' \sim k - j''$, conormal again,

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{2}-j''(s-s'+\frac{1}{2})} \sum_{k'' < k' < k < 2j''} 2^{-ks'-kb-k'(b'-\frac{1}{2})} \alpha_{k-j'',k'} \beta_{j'',k}.$$

The sum over k' is irrelevant, and recalling $s' + b \leq 0$, we are back to the previous case,

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{(\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon)-j''(s+s'+\frac{1}{2}+2b-3\epsilon)} \lambda_{j'',k''},$$

which is $X^{s+s'+2b+\frac{1}{2}-3\epsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 1} \chi_{k'' < 2j''}$.

- If $k'' < k' \sim k$, and $j' \lesssim k - j''$, so that $j'' < k$ and Sobolev is better, hence

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim \sum_{\sup(k'', j'') < k, j' < \inf(\frac{k}{2}, k - j'')} \sum 2^{\frac{k''}{2} + \frac{j'}{2} - j''s - j's' - k(b+b')} \alpha_{j',k} \beta_{j,k},$$

discarding summability, setting $b = b' = 1/2$,

$$c_{j'',k''} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{2} - j''s} 2^{-\sup(k'', j'')(\frac{3}{4} - \frac{s'}{2})} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{2} - j''(s+s' + \frac{3}{2}) + j''(\frac{3s'}{2} + \frac{3}{4})},$$

which, for $s' \leq -\frac{1}{2}$ is $X^{s+s'+\frac{3}{2}-4\epsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 1}$.

3. Finally, $k' = k^\sharp$.

- If $k < k'' \sim k'$ we are back to a $k^\sharp \sim k''$ case.
- If $k'' < k \sim k'$ we are back to the very last case of $k^\sharp = k'$.
- If $k, k'' < k'$, then $j' + j'' \sim k'$, hence $j'' \lesssim k' < 2j''$ (and therefore $k, k'' < 2j''$ as well). We have

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim \sum_{k'', k < k'} 2^{\frac{k''}{2} + \min(\frac{j'}{2}, \frac{k^\sharp - j'}{2}) - k's' - bk - b'k'} 2^{-j''(s-s')} \alpha_{k''-j'', k'} \beta_{j'', k}.$$

Discard summability and assume $b = b' = \frac{1}{2}$, $s' \leq -\frac{1}{2}$,

- Let $k'' < k < k'$, then $k' \sim j' + j''$,
 * if $j' = k' - j'' < k - j'$

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{2} - j''(s-s' + \frac{1}{2})} \sum_{k'' < k} \sum_{k < k' < j'' + \frac{k}{2}} 2^{-s'k' - \frac{k}{2}} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{2} - j''(s+s' + \frac{3}{2})} j'',$$

which yields $X^{s+s'+\frac{3}{2}-4\epsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 1}$,

- * if $k - j' < k' - j''$ we get, if $s' \leq -1$,

$$(A.19) \quad c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{2} - j''(s-s')} \sum_{k'' < k < 2j''} \sum_{j'' + \frac{k}{2} < k' < 2j''} 2^{\frac{j''}{2} - k'(1+s')} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{2} - j''(s-s' - \frac{1}{2}) - 2j''(1+s')} j'',$$

and again the output is $X^{s+s'+\frac{3}{2}-4\epsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, 1}$, while for $-1 < s' \leq -\frac{1}{2}$, retaining the summability $\beta \in l^1$,

$$\begin{aligned} c_{j''k''} &\lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{2} - j''(s-s')} \sum_{k'' < k < 2j''} \sum_{j'' + \frac{k}{2} < k' < 2j''} 2^{\frac{j''}{2} - k'(1+s')} \beta_{j'', k} \\ &\lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{2} - j''(s-s' - \frac{1}{2}) - (j'' + \frac{k''}{2})(1+s')} \lambda_j, \quad \text{with } \lambda \in l^1, \\ &\lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{4} - j''(s+s'+1) - (j - \frac{k''}{2})((-s') - \frac{1}{2})} \lambda_j, \end{aligned}$$

which is $X^{s+s'+1, -\frac{1}{4}, 1}$.

- Let $k < k'' < k'$, then $k' \sim j' + j''$,

* if $k' - j'' < k'' - j'$,

$$(A.20) \quad c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{-j''(s-s'+\frac{1}{2})} \sum_{k < k''} \sum_{k'' < k' < j'' + \frac{k''}{2}} 2^{k'(-s')} \\ \lesssim 2^{-j''(s+s'\frac{3}{2})+\frac{k''}{2}+(s'+1)j''-(s'+1)\frac{k''}{2}} k'',$$

which is again $X^{s+s'+\frac{3}{2}-4\varepsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon, 1}$;

* if $k'' - j' < k' - j''$, either $s' \leq -1$,

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{-j''(s-s'-\frac{1}{2})+\frac{k''}{2}} \sum_{k < k''} \sum_{j'' + \frac{k''}{2} < k' < 2j''} 2^{k'(-s'-1)} \lesssim 2^{-j''(s+s'\frac{3}{2})+\frac{k''}{2}} k'',$$

and we obtain $X^{s+s'+\frac{3}{2}-4\varepsilon, -\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon, 1}$; or $-1 < s' \leq -\frac{1}{2}$ and retaining the summability $\beta \in l^1$,

$$c_{j''k''} \lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{2}-j''(s-s')} \sum_{k < k''} \sum_{j'' + \frac{k''}{2} < k' < 2j''} 2^{\frac{j''}{2}-k'(1+s')} \beta_{j'',k} \\ \lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{2}-j''(s-s'-\frac{1}{2})-(j''+\frac{k''}{2})(1+s')} \lambda_j, \quad \text{with } \lambda \in l^1, \\ \lesssim 2^{\frac{k''}{4}-j''(s+s'+1)-(j-\frac{k''}{2})((-s')-\frac{1}{2})} \lambda_j,$$

which is again $X^{s+s'+1, -\frac{1}{4}, 1}$.

REMARK A.13 *On both this term and the previously similar one, one may notice that the output is such that $b'' = -\frac{1}{4}$. As such, applying a gauge transform will result in a lesser loss ($-\frac{1}{8}$ in general, slightly more in the uniqueness part below $1/4$).*

Finally, collecting all terms, we got all cases we are interested in.

References

- [1] T. Benjamin. Internal waves of permanent form in fluids of great depth. *J. fluid Mech.*, 29:559–592, 1967.
- [2] Jöran Bergh and Jörgen Löfström. *Interpolation spaces. An introduction*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1976. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, No. 223.
- [3] N. Burq and F. Planchon. Smoothing and dispersive estimates for 1d Schrödinger equations with BV coefficients and applications. *Preprint*, [arXiv:math.AP/0409379](#), 2004.
- [4] Nicolas Burq and Fabrice Planchon. Ill-posedness for mBO below scaling. In preparation, 2005.
- [5] J. E. Colliander, J.-M. Delort, C. E. Kenig, and G. Staffilani. Bilinear estimates and applications to 2D NLS. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 353(8):3307–3325 (electronic), 2001.
- [6] J. Ginibre and G. Velo. Smoothing properties and existence of solutions for the generalized Benjamin-Ono equation. *J. Differential Equations*, 93(1):150–212, 1991.
- [7] Nakao Hayashi and Tohru Ozawa. Remarks on nonlinear Schrödinger equations in one space dimension. *Differential Integral Equations*, 7(2):453–461, 1994.

- [8] Alexandru D. Ionescu and E. Kneig, Carlos. Global well-posedness of the Benjamin-Ono equation in low regularity spaces. Preprint, [arXiv:math.AP/0508632](#), 2005.
- [9] Carlos E. Kenig and Kenneth D. Koenig. On the local well-posedness of the Benjamin-Ono and modified Benjamin-Ono equations. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 10(5-6):879–895, 2003.
- [10] Carlos E. Kenig, Gustavo Ponce, and Luis Vega. Quadratic forms for the 1-D semilinear Schrödinger equation. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 348(8):3323–3353, 1996.
- [11] H. Koch and N. Tzvetkov. On the local well-posedness of the Benjamin-Ono equation in $H^s(\mathbb{R})$. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, (26):1449–1464, 2003.
- [12] H. Koch and N. Tzvetkov. Nonlinear wave interactions for the Benjamin-Ono equation. Preprint, [arXiv:math.AP/0411434](#), 2004.
- [13] L. Molinet. Global well-posedness in the energy space for the Benjamin-Ono equation on the circle. Preprint, [arXiv:math.AP/0505479](#), 2005.
- [14] L. Molinet, J. C. Saut, and N. Tzvetkov. Ill-posedness issues for the Benjamin-Ono and related equations. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 33(4):982–988 (electronic), 2001.
- [15] H. Ono. Algebraic solitary waves in stratified fluids. *J. Phys. Soc. Japan*, 39:1082–1091, 1975.
- [16] Gustavo Ponce. On the global well-posedness of the Benjamin-Ono equation. *Differential Integral Equations*, 4(3):527–542, 1991.
- [17] Terence Tao. Multilinear weighted convolution of L^2 -functions, and applications to nonlinear dispersive equations. *Amer. J. Math.*, 123(5):839–908, 2001.
- [18] Terence Tao. Global well-posedness of the Benjamin-Ono equation in $H^1(\mathbb{R})$. *J. Hyperbolic Diff. Eq.*, 1(27–49), 2004.